D.7.S

WITHDRAWN
Q.C.B. LIBRARY

PURCHASED

FOR THE

LIBRARY

OF THE

Wesleyan College,
Birmingham.

SURPLUS COPY
SOW. 1971

JM Gunkel.
June 1971.

ESSAYS ON THE EARLY HISTORY OF THE CHURCH AND THE MINISTRY

MACMILLAN AND CO., LIMITED
LONDON · BOMBAY · CALCUTTA · MADRAS
MELBOURNE

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
NEW YORK · BOSTON · CHICAGO
DALLAS · SAN FRANCISCO

THE MACMILLAN CO. OF CANADA, LTD.
TORONTO

ESSAYS ON THE EARLY HISTORY OF THE CHURCH AND THE MINISTRY

BY VARIOUS WRITERS

EDITED BY

H. B. SWETE, D.D.

In necessariis unitas; in non necessariis libertas; in utrisque caritas.

MACMILLAN AND CO., LIMITED
ST MARTIN'S STREET, LONDON
1918

COPYRIGHT

DEDICATED TO HIS GRACE

RANDALL

LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

CONTENTS

PAGE

Preface by the Editor ix

Supplementary note xviii

ESSAYS

1. *Conceptions of the Church in early times* . 1

ARTHUR JAMES MASON, D.D., D.Th. (Geneva), Canon of Canterbury; formerly Lady Margaret's Reader in Divinity; Honorary Fellow of Pembroke and Jesus Colleges, Cambridge.

2. *The Christian Ministry in the Apostolic and sub-Apostolic periods* 57

JOSEPH ARMITAGE ROBINSON, D.D., Ph.D. (Göttingen), D.Th. (Halle), F.B.A., Dean of Wells; formerly Norrisian Professor of Divinity; Honorary Fellow of Christ's College, Cambridge.

3. *Apostolic Succession: A. The original conception; B. The problem of non-catholic Orders* 93

CUTHBERT HAMILTON TURNER, M.A., D.Litt. (Durham), F.B.A., Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford.

PAGE

4. *The Cyprianic Doctrine of the Ministry* . 215
JOHN HENRY BERNARD, D.D., D.C.L. (Durham), D.D. (Aberdeen), Archbishop of Dublin; formerly Fellow and Archbishop King's Professor of Divinity, Trinity College, Dublin.

5. *Early forms of Ordination* 263
WALTER HOWARD FRERE, D.D., Superior of the Community of the Resurrection, Mirfield; sometime Scholar of Trinity College, Cambridge.

6. *Terms of Communion, and the Ministration of the Sacraments, in early times* . . 313
FRANK EDWARD BRIGHTMAN, M.A., D.D. (Durham), D.Phil. (Louvain), Prebendary of Lincoln, Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford.

Indices 409

PREFACE

THE genesis of this volume must first be briefly told.

In a sermon preached before the University of Cambridge on January 30, 1910, Dr J. M. Wilson, Canon of Worcester, made a strong appeal for a fresh examination of the questions which 'gather round the origin and early developement of episcopacy, and the nature and degree of the sanction which it possesses.'

'The real point' (Canon Wilson said) 'seems to some of us to be to ascertain whether history shows that the Episcopal Churches, Greek, Roman, Anglican, and others, are so exclusively the branches of the Catholic Church that we are debarred by fundamental principles from recognising the non-Episcopal bodies as true branches of the one Catholic Church; whether men are right in saying, what is sometimes stated, that we alone have a divinely commissioned fellowship, and that others have their ministry and their sacraments from below, that is, from human appointment. Are we justified in claiming exclusive privileges?—that sacramental grace is only given through Episcopal orders? Closely connected with this is the history of the prophetic order in the Church of the first two centuries; a charismatic ministry, performing all the offices of the ministry, including the celebration of the Eucharist, yet apparently without the sanction of ordination. ... The time, too, would seem to have come for a re-examination of the subject of the Apostolical Succession; for a statement of the historical evidence for or against the probability of the fact, and the history of the developement of the

dogmas connected with it, in their bearing on the grace and powers conferred in ordination and consecration. Some review seems also to be needed as to the early conceptions of ordination and consecration in the Church; to show whether they did not lay more stress on the pastoral and teaching work of the ministry, and on the continuity of doctrine, and less on its sacramental functions and powers, than we now do. Further historical research is believed to have shown that the investigations promoted by the great Oxford Movement of last century, with its appeal to the historic continuity of the Catholic Church, may now be rightly carried back to a still earlier age, and to a still more Apostolic conception of a Christian ministry....Few of us know on what grounds and when the separation grew up between the conditions for what is called a valid Baptism and those for a valid Eucharist, and the limitation of the latter to men episcopally ordained.'

Canon Wilson's sermon, which was printed in the *Guardian*, and afterwards appended to his book on the *Origin and aim of the Acts*[1], attracted the notice of the Primate, who wrote to suggest that a response should be made to the appeal. His Grace expressed the opinion that it would be opportune to collect and state in as precise a form as possible the latest results of scholarly research bearing on the subject. Such a desire, coming from the Archbishop, had the force of a command. It could best be fulfilled, as I thought, in a series of Essays written by representative scholars, whose names would be a guarantee for breadth of knowledge and accuracy in detail; and an effort was made—successfully, so I rejoice to say—to secure the services of well-known theologians from each of our older Universities. This distribution of the Essays has entailed a long delay in the publication of the book, which I much regret, but which will be pardoned by

[1] pp. 107—141.

those who know under what accumulations of literary work our best students lie. Some of the Essays—the first and the second—have been in type for three or four years, while others—the third and the sixth—have but recently reached completion. The last few years, however, have made few appreciable additions to our knowledge of the early history of the Church, so that notwithstanding the delay, the Essays as a whole may be taken to represent the present state of historical knowledge. Each writer, it may be added, is responsible only for his own contribution ; but an effort has been made to secure some measure of collaboration by circulating the Essays in proof.

A few words may suffice to explain the plan which has been followed in the selection of the subjects and the order of the Essays. Of the very large field which Canon Wilson traverses this volume deals only with a part, namely, the questions relating to Church life and policy on which light is thrown by the history of the first three or four centuries. And in handling these questions, it has seemed best to answer them not *seriatim*, but in the form of Essays dealing with the larger topics to which they belong. The questions resolve themselves into half-a-dozen great subjects of enquiry. These are considered in the following pages after the order which seemed to be most convenient for the purpose of the book. The first two Essays, on early conceptions of the Church, and the primitive Ministry, cover the ground from which have sprung the problems connected with the claims of the Catholic Church and the Episcopate. The third Essay works out at considerable length the history of the crucial doctrine of Apostolic Succession, in both its earlier and its later forms, and the kindred subject of non-catholic Orders. In the fourth Essay a summary is given of the great developements in the theory of the Church and the Ministry which are associated with the name of Cyprian.

This is followed by a discussion of the light recently thrown upon the primitive conception of the Ministry by the earliest forms of ordination, preserved in the 'Church Orders.' Lastly, the sixth Essay examines with great minuteness the ministration in the ancient Church of the great Sacraments, and the terms of Church membership and lay-communion imposed.

Canon Wilson's appeal lay to History, and to History we have gone. Has the hope which inspired the appeal been realized?

The reader will find that few facts emerge from this enquiry, of which no account had been taken previously. Since Lightfoot wrote his classical essay on the Christian Ministry, the only new documents which have thrown important light upon the subject are the *Didache*, and certain of the 'Church Orders.' The *Didache* promised much; but at best it illustrates the practice of some remote Church, and its trustworthiness as a historical monument has been called in question by more than one student of Christian origins. The 'Church Orders' have come down to us in a condition which justifies Dr Frere's description of them as a 'puzzling heap of literature'; yet they offer material for a partial reconstruction of the Ordination services and other rites of the Church in the third and fourth centuries, which brings us some interesting and instructive results.

With these exceptions, the Essays in this book necessarily work over old ground. But the re-examination of the ground is not lost labour. Things new as well as things old are to be found in the familiar field of early Church history, when it is submitted to a fresh scrutiny. Some of the conclusions at which the Essays arrive may be mentioned here. (*a*) Primitive Christianity recognized no invisible Church on earth as distinct from the visible society of the baptized[1]; no

[1] p. 9 ff.

self-governing power in the local congregation apart from the authority of the whole Body of Christ[1]; no assured gifts of grace outside the Catholic communion[2]. (*b*) Bishop Lightfoot's account of the origin of the Episcopate is reaffirmed[3], and the theory of a 'charismatic' ministry based upon the *Didache* is found to have no support from the passages in St Paul's Epistles which had been quoted in its favour[4]. (*c*) It was the Gnostic peril of the second century which gave prominence to the principle of Apostolic Succession[5]. When Gnosticism laid claim to a secret tradition derived from the Apostles, the Catholic Church replied by pointing to churches whose bishops could shew an unbroken succession from Apostolic founders, which guaranteed an unbroken tradition of Apostolic teaching in the Rule of Truth[6]. As to the bearing of this principle on the question of the validity of non-Catholic Sacraments we are brought up against a serious difference of opinion[7]. Cyprian held the nullity of heretical and schismatical baptism, and, by inference, the nullity of Orders conferred outside the Catholic Church. Augustine, on the other hand, held that the grace of the Sacraments is not nullified by errors either of life or doctrine on the part of the minister, since it is derived from Christ's institution and power, and not from the human agent; and he included Holy Orders under his canon. This was but the logical result of his principle, but it was long before it gained acceptance in the West. While the West steadily refused to re-baptize heretics and schismatics, many centuries passed before there was any final recognition of the validity of their Orders[8], even when the form and matter and general intention were the same as in Catholic ordinations.

* * * *

[1] p. 19 ff. [2] p. 33 f. [3] p. 87 f. [4] p. 65 ff.
[5] p. 96. [6] p. 101 ff. [7] p. 144 ff. [8] pp. 145, 170.

(*d*) The Cyprianic doctrine of the Ministry marks a developement in more than one direction. The Episcopate, universally recognized from the time of Irenaeus, has become, in Cyprian's conception, the keystone of Catholic unity[1]. Supreme in his own Church, the priest and pastor of the flock, the bishop is subject only to Christ: the Church knows no other 'Bishop of bishops.' The bishops of the Catholic Church are a *collegium* which is to the whole Church what the individual bishop is to his own community. The unity of the Episcopate secures the unity of the Church, and this was what our Lord designed to teach by building His Church on one of the Apostles[2]. The Roman Church, in Cyprian's judgement, was founded by Peter, and its bishop sat in Peter's chair. But he did not draw the inference that the Roman Church or Bishop is the centre of Catholic unity, which he finds in the voice of the collective Episcopate. 'To be Catholic is not necessarily to be Roman'; so the teaching of Cyprian on the Church and the Ministry may be briefly summarized[3].

(*e*) The witness of Cyprian is that of a bishop pre-eminent in his own generation, but possessing no claim to represent any Church but that of North Africa. The Church Orders on the other hand reveal a fairly wide circle of Church-opinion in the third and fourth centuries. In them we can mark the developement of the relation between the episcopate and the presbyterate. In the earlier stage the bishop is a presbyter distinguished from other presbyters by his power of ordination[4]; later on, the presbyter takes a distinctly lower position than the bishop, for whom special gifts of the Spirit, such as distinguished the Apostolate, are desired. In the earliest Order confessors are entitled to rank with presbyters; in the later

[1] p. 242 ff. [2] p. 245 ff. [3] p. 262.
[4] p. 276 ff.

forms, only the minor orders are open to them[1]. The permission which the *Didache* gives to prophets to dispense with the use of liturgical forms at the Eucharist has disappeared from all the Orders but one, and there is no ground for thinking that prophets were ever admitted, like confessors, to the presbyterate without ordination[2].

The general conception of Holy Orders conveyed in these early rites of ordination is that the Church in ordaining to any ministry recognizes vocation by election, and then solemnly by prayer and laying on of hands invests the man whom God has called with authority to act as her representative, and invokes upon him the special grace which his office requires[3].

(*f*) From the early ordination services we turn to the administration of the Sacraments which are necessary for all members of the Church, whether lay or in the *clerus*.

The scrupulous care which was taken to exclude from Baptism adults whose calling or way of life was inconsistent with Christian principles is illustrated at length[4]. Not less careful was the ancient Church to instruct her catechumens in both the moral and doctrinal sanctions of Christianity[5]. The Order of Baptism is next described, including the rite of Confirmation, and the subsequent Communion of the baptized and confirmed[6]. The baptism of infants, for which there is clear evidence from the time of Irenaeus, was safeguarded by sponsorship[7].

* * * *

The scope of these Essays is limited to historical investigation. What the writer of the first Essay has said in his opening paragraph[8], with regard to his own particular subject, holds true, *mutatis mutandis*, of all the discussions in this book. It does not belong to

[1] p. 289. [2] pp. 273, 292 ff. [3] p. 307 ff. [4] p. 320 ff.
[5] pp. 331 ff. [6] pp. 342 ff. [7] p. 352. [8] p. 3.

this volume to enquire whether the Christians of the first days were right in the answers which they gave to the problem that lay before them; 'whether time has brought about such changes as make these answers no longer applicable'; or 'whether we ought to form' conceptions 'quite independent of the ancient theories, and to act freely upon' them. We are concerned here simply with the statement of facts, and their interpretation. To those who turn to the early history of the Church with the expectation of finding there ready-made solutions of present difficulties, such results as have been specified will be disappointing. Others, who attach little weight to the precedents of early Christianity, will be disposed to regard all such enquiries with suspicion, or to put them on one side as irrelevant.

The right attitude towards the history of our faith lies between these extremes, consisting neither in a blind acceptance of all that bears the hall-mark of antiquity, nor in the equally fatuous refusal to be guided, where guidance is needed, by ancient precedent. Our ecclesiastical polity, like our national life, is built on precedents, and it is of no little importance that those of the undivided Church should be once more collected and examined, as we stand on the border-line of a new age. How far the history of the ancient Church can be made available for the guidance of the Church as it now exists, is a question on which opinions will differ. Our own Church at the Reformation definitely took her stand upon the principle of a general return to primitive models, appealing to the early centuries against the accretions of Latin Christianity. But it cannot be said that the Anglican Church has consistently reverted in all respects to primitive conceptions or to primitive custom. Nor indeed was it to be desired that she should do so. The fetish of primitiveness is scarcely less to be deprecated than the fetish of mediaevalism; neither the primitive nor the mediaeval life, if

torn away from its original surroundings and transferred to a soil where the conditions are alien from those in which it grew up, is likely to thrive or to bear good fruit. Each age of the Church must live its own life, and deal with its own problems, following to a great extent the lead of circumstances, which offer in fact a Divine guidance for the shaping of its course. Nevertheless the study of Church history has a strong claim upon the attention of the ecclesiastical statesman; the unique position of the Christian Society, as a continuous and progressive organization under the direction of the Spirit of Christ, gives special importance to principles and institutions which, taking their beginnings in primitive times, were accepted by the whole Church, or by the Church in the West, down to the sixteenth century. To abandon these would be to sacrifice historical continuity, and to cast doubt upon the presence in the Church of the Holy Spirit, Who came to guide the Body of Christ into all the truth. Such principles, such institutions, belong to the *bene esse*, if not indeed to the *esse*, of the Church. What they are, these Essays will, it is hoped, have helped to make plain; what attitude the Church should take towards bodies of Christian people who have either definitely rejected them, or have drifted away into another line of things, is for those to determine who are called to the harder task of guarding faith and order. To these, our fathers in God, this volume is humbly submitted, in the hope that it may in some measure assist their deliberations and thus promote the cause of truth and peace.

H. B. S.

Hitchin,
March, 1917.

SUPPLEMENTARY NOTE

Few scholars of our day have laboured more untiringly than Dr Swete until a time beyond the ordinary span of human life. The editing of this volume of *Essays* was a task very near his heart, and he had watched anxiously for the last six or seven years over its progress and developement. During the winter of 1916–17 the material then still outstanding was coming rather rapidly into his hands, and in March he was able to put pen to paper with the preface—not of course quite complete—printed in the foregoing pages. It was the last piece of work that came from him, and it is no unworthy parting message. He had greatly hoped that he was being spared to see the publication of the book, and expressed this belief till within a few days of his death[1].

[1] The Bishop of Ely, Dr Chase, kindly allows the following passage to be repeated from the concluding paragraph of his article 'Henry Barclay Swete' in the *Church Quarterly Review* for October 1917 (p. 119).

'When he was eighty years old he resigned his professorship, not because he or indeed others saw signs of failing ability, but because he felt it to be right. He laid down, as he took up, the burden of great responsibilities at the call of duty. He left Cambridge and settled at Hitchin. There he continued his literary activity, especially in connexion with the work of editing a volume of *Essays on the Early History of the Church and the Ministry*.... About Easter his friends were alarmed to hear that he was seriously ill. All through his illness he made a gallant fight, always saying that he "had been spared to finish the *Essays*." When others saw that his time was short, he still continued to have faith that he would return to life and to the *Essays*. At last there came an attack of syncope; but he was not told of the danger. That evening his niece, who so devotedly had shared his life and watched over him for many years, was sitting by him, and he said to her "I am beginning to wonder whether after all I can recover; what do you think?" She replied "No, dear, I do not think you can, neither does Dr Cosens." He was silent for a moment and then said a few words as to who should finish the task of editing the *Essays*. In that sentence he laid down his work and then "stedfastly set his face to go to Jerusalem."'

But when he learnt that it was not to be, he quietly directed the transference of the editorial work into other hands, and on Thursday the 10th of May 1917 he passed away 'serene, patient, and conscious to the very end.' *In pace requiescat.*

There was little left to be done, and that for the most part of a mechanical or strictly limited kind, in finishing off the editorial work. An attentive reader will notice that in several small matters the Essayists have been each a law to himself: that in citations from the Latin one employs *u* and another *v*; that to one the formula of comparison is *cf.* and to another *cp.*; that one has *ff.* and another *sqq.*; that one uses a second *s* in the genitive of names ending in *s*, while another avoids it. Ideally, essays contributed to a common stock should follow in such details a single norm; but, as things turned out, it was thought best to allow each Essayist to adopt on most points his own custom, and only to secure uniformity within each Essay. At the time of Dr Swete's death, the two first Essays had been printed off: the fourth and fifth had for some time been ready for final paging: the third was only just completed. The closing revision of pp. 81–304 was carried through in the early summer: the autumn months have been occupied with the last hundred pages, and with the index work. It was felt that the special character of the book demanded an unusually full system of indexing, and it is hoped that the index, in particular, of references to 'Ancient authorities' will illustrate, better than many words could do, the stately proportions of the evidence from ante-Nicene times which lies behind the argument of the Essays. A special acknowledgement is due to the exertions of the authorities and staff of the Cambridge University Press who, even in these days of depleted numbers, have never flagged in the care and rapidity of their printing.

It goes without saying that the tardy progress of the

volume has been the cause of some injustice to the Essays that were first put into type. Dr Mason's and Dr Robinson's Essays had reached their ultimate form as long ago as before the beginning of the war: Dr Frere's Essay was also by that time in proof, and though it received subsequently a good deal of revision, it was, at the moment when Dom Connolly's vindication of the Hippolytean authorship of the *Egyptian Church Order* appeared in October 1916, too far advanced towards its final stage to admit of more than a summary reference at the conclusion of the Essay. But notwithstanding all imperfections and delays the Essayists, believing that the attempt was worth making to state in positive form, eschewing controversy, what seem to them the results of the re-investigation of the historical evidence, in detail and in mass, trust that their joint effort may contribute something to the nearer attainment of the Truth and Peace which are for all of us the common goal.

VERITATEM ET IVDICIVM PACIS IVDICATE IN PORTIS VESTRIS

Advent, 1917.

ESSAY I

CONCEPTIONS OF THE CHURCH IN EARLY TIMES

A. J. MASON, D.D.

SUMMARY

Did Christ found the Church ? The earliest Christians would probably have cared little whether He did so in His earthly life or whether it was founded by His Spirit afterwards. In any case it was, in their view, of Divine origin.

This is involved in the title of the Ecclesia, the new Israel. The Church regarded as the continuation and expansion of the earlier People of God.

No difference made in ancient times between an 'invisible' and a 'visible' Church (2 Clement, Hermas, Clement of Alexandria).

The Church and the Churches. The 'Catholic' Church necessarily unique. Rival organizations like Montanism claimed this unique position : the only Church recognized by Tertullian consists of the adherents of the prophets. Prophecy had in fact been a great agent in establishing the system which he denounced. All ministries in the Catholic Church considered charismatic.

The Church an embodiment of the Holy Spirit, which was not to be found elsewhere. The Church Virgin and Mother. The presence of imperfections did not destroy her sanctity. Ecclesiastical discipline. Authority within the Church. Vigilance with regard to doctrine. Tradition ; the 'deposit,' safeguarded by the succession of authoritative teachers (Irenaeus, Tertullian, Hippolytus, Clement of Alexandria, Origen). The Rule of Faith. The Unity of the early Church a real unity.

I

CONCEPTIONS OF THE CHURCH IN EARLY TIMES

What the Church is; what it was considered to be by the Christians of the first days; whether they, or any of them, were right in their answers; whether time has brought about such changes as make these answers no longer applicable; whether we ought to form a conception of the Church quite independent of the ancient theories, and to act freely upon it;—these are the kind of questions which challenge our attention. The object of this essay is to deal only with the second of the series. It is for the ecclesiastical statesman to judge what answer should be given to the rest. The historian can only be required to provide him with such guidance as may be derived from a clear presentment of the facts.

'My Church'—in what sense?

Probably the first element in the problem which is new to our time is the doubt now raised with regard to the historical relation between the Church and Christ. Did Christ in His earthly career contemplate the foundation of a religious system, to continue till the end of the world? Was there present to His mind a conception which He could describe as 'My Church'?

To those who esteem the evidence of the First Gospel as final and conclusive, there can be no hesitation. But it must be admitted that the number of believing Christians who regard the First Gospel in that light is no longer so great as it was. Viewed simply as a historical document, its reputation is not now as high as that of the Gospels of St Mark and St Luke. If there were no evidence of Christ's intention besides that which is supplied by three or four sayings attributed to Him in St Matthew, it might be thought precarious to affirm that He intended to found a Church. In the other scale of the balance are all those eschatological considerations of which so much is now heard, and which are not lightly to be set aside.

But the evidence is not wholly confined to those few texts. It may be regarded as certain that our Lord singled out twelve disciples to stand in a special relationship to Himself and to 'the twelve tribes of Israel[1].' Many of His parables, if we may trust the records of them, shew that He did not always think of the Kingdom of God as coming quickly; and though the Kingdom and the Church are far from being identical conceptions, the parables at least leave room for the employment of a Church in the promotion of the Kingdom. To these facts must be added whatever historical value there may be in the last discourse in the Fourth Gospel, with regard to the work of the coming Paraclete and to the future of the disciples in the world. In any case, whether Christ expressed His purpose to found a Church or not, these passages in the Gospels are clear evidence that important Christians of the first century in very various quarters believed that He did so. It cannot be doubted that St Paul believed the same. The Epistle to the Ephesians, with its doctrine that Christ 'loved the Church and gave Himself for it,' would be difficult to account for,

[1] Matt. xix 28, Luke xxii 30.

if the writer did not suppose that our Lord, before His death, had set His heart upon establishing the society so described. The question whether this supposition was correct will be decided, not by the interpretation of particular texts, but in accordance with general considerations of the person and work of Christ. Perhaps at the present moment we are not so certain about the conditions of our Lord's earthly life as to be able to decide positively.

It is not unlikely, however, that if St Paul, or other Christians of his age, had been asked whether the Church was founded by Christ Himself, they would have been surprised at the question, and would have treated it as one of no great consequence. To them the unity between Christ and the Holy Spirit was so perfect,—they were so vividly conscious of being guided by 'the Spirit of Jesus,'—they were so confident that the work which went on under their hands was the work of God,—that it was a matter of comparative indifference to them at what stage in His career the Lord had given the first impetus to the movement. It might have been when St Peter made his famous confession; it might have been during the forty days when the Lord spoke to His disciples of the things concerning the Kingdom of God; it might have been after His ascension, when He began in a new sense to give gifts unto men. That the Church was a Divine, and not a human, institution, was a proposition which they could not have doubted.

The word Ecclesia.

The title by which they came to denote it is a sufficient proof of the assertion. By whatever other names they may have described themselves—the brethren, the disciples, the believers, those of the 'Way'—it was not long before they had found a more satisfying word, which was destined to last. The

significance of the term *Ecclesia* in Christian language is now well understood. The work of enquiry has been amply done for English readers in Hort's posthumously published Lectures on *The Christian Ecclesia*[1]. It has been done more briefly in Harnack's *Constitution and Law of the Church in the First Two Centuries*[2]. The word is taken over from the sacred vocabulary of the older dispensation. Its secular connexion, indeed, is not to be overlooked. It is, as among the Athenians, an assembly of the sovereign people, not any fortuitous gathering[3]. But in passing through the Greek translation of the Old Testament the word has acquired a special connotation. 'In the Septuagint *Ecclesia* is the name for the people of Israel solemnly assembled before God (in Hebrew *Kahal*), whether an actual assembly is intended, or the ideal unity of Israel as before God. The *Ecclesia* in the language of Hellenistic Judaism is the people of Israel, so far as it is the people of God, the Chosen People, the people in whom and with whom the power of God is operative. The usage of the word in the Christian community is derived from this. *Ecclesia* now denotes the Israel of the New Testament, God's people of the New Testament. The expression contains the notion of the assembly of a people, not of the assembly of an association[4]. It is the assembly of the Covenant People of the New Testament, i.e. of Christendom; and the notion is that of an assembly of this people before God and with God[5].'

[1] Macmillan 1897.

[2] Williams and Norgate 1910 p. 15 foll. (translated from *Entstehung und Entwickelung der Kirchenverfassung und des Kirchenrechts in den zwei ersten Jahrhunderten*, Leipzig, 1910).

[3] Sohm *Kirchenrecht* p. 16.

[4] By the word here rendered 'association' (*Verein*) Sohm means a voluntary union, drawn together by the mutual agreement of the members.

[5] Sohm *Kirchenrecht* p. 17 foll. These remarks certainly hold true for the exegesis of Matt. xvi 18, and for the conception which that passage represents. At the same time it must not be forgotten that the word

The audacity of faith implied in the selection of the word escapes us. To us, Christendom is the great mass of enlightened humanity, with nineteen centuries of history to its credit, while the ancient Israel has receded into the position of a remarkable little nation whose chief function was to prepare the way for the new religion. To the first disciples it was far otherwise. Judaism was still an imposing fabric. So far as appearances went, it had a claim to represent all that was most venerable in religion. Abraham and Moses, David and the prophets, the heroes of the Captivity and of the Restoration, belonged to it. What inspired the little handful of disciples at Jerusalem, and in Judaea and Galilee, to set up so vast a counter-claim? The fact that they did so is a proof of their absolute confidence in the Lord Jesus and His Messiahship. The Israel according to the flesh, which rejected Him, and fulfilled the prophecies by rejecting Him, had forfeited all right to be considered the Israel of God. The right had passed to those who acknowledged Him. They refused to consider themselves a mere 'sect' of the Jews, among other 'sects,' like the Pharisees or Sadducees. They were not content to be a 'synagogue,' like the synagogue of the Libertines and Cyrenians. They were an Ecclesia; they were *the* Ecclesia,—the Ecclesia of the Christ and of God.

The consciousness of their spiritual connexion with the elder Israel was vividly present to the New Testament writers. St Paul everywhere assumes it, where he does not assert it. The way in which he reminds the Corinthian Christians, Gentile and Jew alike, that 'all our fathers were baptized into Moses in the cloud and in the sea' is a sufficient illustration of the point. 'The elect sojourners of the Dispersion' to whom

ἐκκλησία is also occasionally used in a more general sense in the LXX, representing other Hebrew words than *Qahal*. See e.g. I Sam. xix 20 τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τῶν προφητῶν, Ecclus. xxvi 5 ἐκκλησίαν ὄχλου.

the First Epistle of St Peter is addressed were not Jews only. Even the Epistle of St James, in addressing 'the twelve tribes in the Dispersion,' contemplates tribes consisting of none but Christians[1]. The belief that the Christian Church is the continuation and expansion of the Church before Christ survived among Christians as part of their tradition. It made Clement of Rome, himself perhaps a Jew, see in the election of Christians the fulfilment of the prophecy that Jacob should become the portion of the Lord, and Israel the measurement of His inheritance[2]. It expressed itself in Justin's controversy with the Jewish Trypho, though the argument takes the curious turn of asserting that Christ Himself is the mystical Israel of the prophets, and that Christians accordingly are Israel by virtue of their union with Him[3]. It is clearly before the mind of Irenaeus;—God, he says, 'brings into the kingdom of heaven Abraham and his seed, which is the Church, through Christ Jesus[4].' It appears to underlie the newly recovered Odes of Solomon, where the Christian Church is spiritually identified with the unchangeable and predestined Temple of the Jews, and heresies and persecutions alike fail to destroy it:—'No man, O my God, changeth Thy holy place,...for Thy sanctuary Thou hast designed before Thou didst make other places: that which is the elder shall not be altered by those that are younger than itself':—'they sought for my death and did not find it, for I was older than the memorial of them[5].' The continuity of Christianity with the religion of the earlier days is taught by Clement

1 See Dr Hort on St James p. xxiii, and on 1 St Peter p. 7.

2 Clem. Rom. 29.

3 See particularly § 123 (Otto 1877 p. 444).

4 *Haer.* IV 8. 1 (Massuet).

5 Odes 4 and 28. I use Harris's translation, but I cannot agree with his literal interpretation of Ode 4, altogether out of keeping with the general character of the Odes, although Harnack accepts it (*T. und U.* Bd. xxxv).

of Alexandria, and forms part of the lofty prologue to the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius.

As the Church became predominantly a Gentile Church, the force of this conception grew more faint. Probably after the middle of the second century few of those who used the word Ecclesia were aware of its early religious history. Origen contrasts 'the Ecclesia of God at Athens' with 'the Athenian Ecclesia' in a way which indicates that he thought of the word only from the Gentile and political point of view[1]. Nevertheless the history had done its work. In spite of Marcion, the Old Testament and its promises had become the safe heritage of the Christian Church. The term Ecclesia had successfully lodged in Christian minds the consciousness of belonging to a great and united fellowship, Divine in origin and existing for the highest purposes.

The Church was the visible organization which bears that name.

We must proceed to ask whether the fellowship thus denoted was the historical—the 'empiric'—body which passes under the name, or whether it is an ideal quantity, whose very existence is known only by faith. In this enquiry the modern scholar is aided by a very remarkable work. The publication in 1892 of Rudolf Sohm's *Kirchenrecht*[2] may be said to mark an epoch in the study of the doctrine of the Church. The theory set forth in it has not been left uncriticized[3], but on certain points the assertions of Sohm will hardly be called in question again.

[1] *contra Celsum* III 30, p. 227 Koetschau.

[2] It is called the first volume, but no second has appeared. In 1909, however, it was followed by a brief and vigorous restatement of the author's views under the title of *Wesen und Ursprung des Katholizismus*.

[3] Notably by Harnack in his *Constitution and Law of the Church*.

In this work and its sequel Sohm has shewn clearly that the distinction between the Church as a religious conception and the Church as a concrete institution—a distinction upon which he himself insists with vehemence—was wholly unknown to the Christians of early times. 'Early Christianity had not, indeed, an explicit doctrine of the visible nature of the Church in the religious sense; but in an instinctive and naïve fashion the visible community of Christians, as such, was identified with the fellowship of the saints, the elect, the children of God who are led by His Spirit[1].' The notion of an invisible Church of the Predestinate, Sohm says, came into men's minds before many centuries after Christ had elapsed. Augustine, Wiclif entertained it. But Luther was the first to whom the contrast between the two things became a religious certainty. No one before Luther had been able to emancipate himself in conscience from the visible Church. Until his time the opposition between the true Church of Christ and the corporate society did not exist, so far as the practical life of Christendom was concerned. All antiquity, from the first century to the end of the Middle Ages, had failed to draw the sharp and ruthless line of demarcation which ought to be drawn[2]. It was not in a position to do so[3].

The pre-existent Church of Valentinus.

There are facts in the history of early Christian thought which seem to militate against this view; and it is our duty to examine them. Valentinus, or at any rate some of the Valentinians, spoke, as is well known, of the Church as a being of a higher order, existing

[1] *Wesen und Ursprung* p. 354.
[2] *ibid.* p. 344 f. [3] *ibid.* p. 354.

before the present world, and coming down into it and becoming incarnate. To this Church belonged the spiritual seed and no others,—these, of course, being the true Gnostics. This Church, in Heracleon's adaptation of the system, though corrupted by intercourse with material things, yet awaited the coming of Christ, like the Samaritan woman, who in spite of her unedifying past, was yet persuaded that a Christ was coming who should know all things[1].

The teaching of 2 Clement.

Nor was such a conception known only to speculative thinkers outside the Catholic Church. On the contrary, the language of the Valentinian system occurs almost word for word in the homily which was long known as the Second Epistle of the Roman Clement. 'If we do the will of God our Father,' says the orthodox preacher, 'we shall be of the first Church, which is spiritual, which was created before the sun and moon...Let us choose to be of the Church of life, that we may be saved...The Books of the Apostles plainly declare that the Church existeth not now for the first time, but hath been from the beginning: for she was spiritual, as our Jesus also was spiritual, but was manifested in the last days that He might save us. Now the Church, being spiritual, was manifested in the flesh of Christ[2].'

Here, it might be thought, we have as complete a division between the living Church, the first Church, the spiritual Church, and the earthly society, as might satisfy a Luther or a Sohm. The impression will not be lessened by reading the words of Anastasius quoted

[1] See Lipsius' article *Valentinus* in Smith's *Dict. of Chr. Biogr.*; Preuschen's in Hauck-Herzog *Realencyklopädie*; Brooke's *Fragments of Heracleon* in *Texts and Studies* (1891) p. 44.

[2] § 14, Lightfoot's translation.

by Lightfoot in his notes on the passage. The admirable interpreters of the early Church, this Father says, laid it down that as Christ is at the same time heavenly and earthly, so there are also 'two Churches, the earthly one, and the heavenly city of the Lord of Hosts.' Yet Lightfoot felt himself justified in saying that 'this doctrine of an eternal Church seems to be a developement of the Apostolic teaching which insists on the foreordained purpose of God as having elected a body of men to serve Him from all eternity.' 'The language of our preacher,' he says, 'stands midway...between this teaching of St Paul and the doctrine of the Valentinians.' That it implied no disparagement of the Church upon earth is seen from the sequel. The preacher argues in fact that the heavenly origin of the Church is a reason for respecting its incarnation in the world. 'If any of us guard her in the flesh and defile her not, he shall receive her again in the Holy Spirit,' —that is, Lightfoot explains, 'by being incorporated in the celestial, spiritual Church';—'for this flesh,' that is, the earthly embodiment of the heavenly Church, 'is the counterpart and copy of the spirit. No man therefore, when he hath defiled the copy, shall receive the original for his portion[1].'

Of Hermas.

An excellent author upon whom to test the twofold conception is Hermas. Perhaps no other author before Cyprian had bestowed so much thought upon the conception of the Church. The Church appears to Hermas frequently as an authoritative instructress in

[1] What he meant by 'defiling' the Church on earth may perhaps be explained—especially in view of the Corinthian connexions of the homily—by a reference to St Paul's language in I Cor. iii 17. On the conception of the new Jerusalem coming down from heaven see Swete on Rev. iii 12, xxi 10.

moral and spiritual things. She appears in the form of an aged and reverend woman, who becomes younger and more beautiful in her looks in proportion as Hermas increases in his power of perception. Her age betokens no decrepitude, but (like the white hairs of Christ in the Apocalypse) her sublime antiquity. She was the first of all things to be created, and the world was framed for her[1]. The creation of God's Holy Church is an act of wisdom and foreknowledge parallel to that of planting the heavens and laying the foundations of the earth above the waters[2]. The Church appears again as a virgin and a bride coming forth out of her chamber[3]. The faithful are her children, and she addresses them as their mother[4]. So wholly is she possessed by the Spirit of God, as to be like an incarnation of Him;—the Holy Spirit has spoken to Hermas in the form of the Church[5].

No one will deny that this is a portrait of the ideal Church, taken in part from the teaching of St Paul and of the Seer of Patmos, in part from the teaching of the Jewish prophets and apocalyptic writers[6]. And this ideal Church exhibits to Hermas the process by which the historic Church is built up. She shews him a tower in course of erection. It is built upon the waters of baptism[7]. Stones of various value are worked into it. 'Apostles and bishops and teachers and deacons' who perform their functions worthily are the best stones that it contains. Some of these have already died, others are still living[8]. Many of the stones which are set in the tower prove to be unfitted for their place, and are cast away,—either for a time,

[1] Vis. II iv 1.
[2] Vis. I iii 4, cp. Isaiah li 16.
[3] Vis. IV ii 1.
[4] Vis. III viii 9.
[5] Sim. IX 1.
[6] e.g. IV Esdr. vi 55, vii 11.
[7] Vis. III iii 5.
[8] Vis. III v 1.

to be restored by penitence, or for ever. Some, who can never be restored to a place in the tower, may yet be purified by suffering and admitted to some other, humbler position of salvation, after the tower is completed[1]. There are traces of discord and division here and there in the walls of the tower, which have to be removed.

It would seem, at first sight, as if Hermas designed to indicate a complete difference between the heavenly Church, the true Church of God, and the actual society of Christians upon earth, faulty and imperfect. Occasionally, the ideal Church, who is shewing the vision to the seer, uses language which might imply that the tower is the Church in a different sense from herself. 'Say unto the rulers of the Church,' she bids Hermas, 'that they direct their paths in righteousness.' 'Thou shalt read aloud to thy city with the presbyters who preside over the Church.' 'I say unto you that are leaders of the Church and that hold the chief seats, be not like the poisoners.' 'The Church' is spoken of by the august lady with a kind of detachment, as if it were another institution.

But this interpretation of the views of Hermas is expressly excluded by his own words. 'Thou wilt not cease asking for revelations,' the august lady says to him; 'thou art importunate. The tower which thou seest in course of building is I, the Church, who have appeared to thee before and am appearing to thee at this moment[2].' The difference is not one of identity, but only of condition. The tower is as yet incomplete. When it is complete, and its Master has come to inspect it and has tried the stones that compose it, it will assume a different appearance from that which it wears while the process of erection is still going on.

[1] Vis. III vii 6. [2] Vis. III iii 3.

But, unfinished and finished, it is the same tower. The tower and the majestic lady are one[1].

Of Clement of Alexandria.

If any ancient Christian author was capable of discriminating between the actual Church and the ideal, it was Clement of Alexandria. There are times when it appears as if he did so. He goes so far as to say, like the ancient preacher before mentioned, that 'the Church on earth is an image of the heavenly Church[2],' as if they were separate entities. He speaks elsewhere of 'the heavenly Church,' which is identified with 'the kingdom of God,' for whose feasts of love men ought to practise at their convivial gatherings here[3]. He speaks of a 'spiritual Church,' in which the soul which has become thoroughly spiritual abides in its kindred element unto the repose of God[4]. In what relation does this Church stand to the historical society?

It is never easy to fix with precision the meaning of Clement's language. But a comparison of these passages with his general teaching about the Church appears to shew that when Clement speaks of the 'heavenly Church,' 'the spiritual Church,' he does not consider it to be something different from 'the Church on earth.' It is that part of the same Church which has already been released from earthly restrictions. 'Feed

[1] It may be well to add that while Hermas can sometimes contemplate the Christian world as only a multitude of individual souls, who have received the law of God, and are dealt with according to their several deserts (Sim. VIII 3), he bears copious witness at other times to the fact that believers were not in a condition so shapeless and inorganic. His incidental disclosures of the way in which the Church of his day was governed are full of interest, but the study of his testimony in this respect does not belong to the present enquiry.

[2] *Strom.* IV 66, 1—p. 278 Stählin.

[3] *Paed.* II 6, 2—p. 157 Stählin.

[4] *Strom.* VII cap. XI 68, 5—p. 49 Stählin; see Mayor's note *ad loc.*

us,' he cries on behalf of the catechumens who require the Divine *Paedagogus*, 'upon Thy holy mountain, even at Thy Church which is exalted, which rises above the clouds, which reaches unto heaven[1].' The lower portion of the Church is upon the earth, but its top is lost to sight. He speaks of 'the inferior parts in the temple of the Lord which is the entire Church,' compared with the highest of all, 'where the Lord is.' The Church is as yet incomplete, and it is our duty to help to complete it. 'Let us fulfil the fair person of the Church and run as babes to the good Mother[2].' In so doing, we both gain our own maturity, and make the Church what she is to be. The doctrine is not luminous, but there is no suggestion that this growing Church is something different from the 'first-born Church[3],' 'our mother, the Church,' the Rebekah with whom Christ, the true Isaac, makes merry,—'His helpmate in the work of our salvation[4].' To Clement, as to others, the Church, the visible society to which he belongs, is at once Mother and Virgin, and he cannot conceive of more than one. 'One is the Father of all, and one the Word of all, and the Holy Ghost is one and the self-same everywhere, and one and one only is both Virgin and Mother. So I love to call the Church,... undefiled as a virgin, loving as a mother[5].'

But within this one gracious Church Clement is able, like Hermas before him, to recognize that there are at present elements which are not destined to be permanent. 'Does not the Apostle speak of these men as the "flesh" of the holy body? The name of body

[1] *Paed.* I 84, 3—p. 139 Stählin ; cp. *Protrept.* XII 119, 1 foll.—p. 84 Stählin.

[2] *Paed.* III 99, 1—p. 290 Stählin.

[3] *Protrept.* IX 82, 6—p. 62 Stählin.

[4] *Paed.* I 21, 1 ; 22, 2—p. 102 f. Stählin.

[5] *Paed.* I 42, 1—p. 115 Stählin ; cp. 10, 2—p. 96. In another connexion he demurs to the title ; *Strom.* VI 146, 2—p. 507 Stählin.

is figuratively applied to the Church of the Lord, the spiritual and holy company; and those of them who have only been called by the name, and do not live accordingly, are the flesh. Now "the body"—this spiritual body, i.e. the holy Church—is not to be used "for fornication" or for apostasy from the gospel to the heathen way of life, in any wise or in any degree. For a man who behaves within the Church like a heathen, whether it be in deed, or in word, or even in thought, commits fornication against the Church and his own body. A man who is joined unto this harlot, i.e. to action contrary to the covenant, becomes another body, which is not holy[1].' Such persons have indeed been admitted into the only Church of which Clement has cognizance, the holy Church, the Church of the Lord, the spiritual body, the spiritual and holy company; but they remain only the 'flesh' of that body, and by their transgression they pass from it eventually into other connexions.

We must, therefore, understand that when Clement says that the Church on earth is an image of the heavenly Church, he does not mean to distinguish between two radically different conceptions of the Church, such as those which Luther contrasted. The heavenly Church was the invisible and perfected part of the same sacred society of which the Church on earth is the visible part. The latter is an image of the former, inasmuch as it is striving to attain the character which the blessed above have attained already. 'The Church on earth is an image of the heavenly, as we indicate when we pray that the will of God may be done upon earth also as it is in heaven[2].'

[1] *Strom.* VII 87, 3 foll.—p. 62 Stählin.

[2] This kind of language was evidently somewhat distasteful to Origen. He meets a criticism of Celsus by the remark that it was perhaps derived *ἀπὸ τοῦ ὑπό τινων λέγεσθαι ἐκκλησίας τινὸς ἐπουρανίου...ἀπόρροιαν εἶναι τὴν ἐπὶ γῆς ἐκκλησίαν.* The terms smacked to him of Valentinus. *Contra Celsum* VI 35 (Koetschau p. 104).

For the rest, Clement's attitude towards the historical Church on earth is clear from all ambiguity. Free as his mind was, and ready to welcome truth and beauty wherever it was to be found, his allegiance to the historical society was undivided and unquestioning. 'In the true and ancient Church' alone accurate knowledge was to be found[1]. Even if sometimes an assembly of heretics is called 'their Church[2],' Clement says that the heretical communities are 'schools' rather than 'Churches[3].' Holy Scripture shews that they are wrong and the Church right. They may have opinions, but the Church has knowledge. 'The man of knowledge, and he alone, growing old in the Scriptures themselves, preserves the orthodox doctrine of the Apostles and of the Church[4].' 'The human conventicles' are all 'later in time than the Catholic Church[5].' They are 'spurious innovations upon the earliest and truest Church.' 'There is only one true Church, the really ancient Church, in which those who are righteous according to God's purpose are enrolled,...which [the heretics] violently break up into many sects. In essence and in idea and in origin and in preeminence we say that the ancient Catholic Church stands alone, bringing together by the will of the one God through the one Lord "into the unity of the one faith" which underlies the respective covenants (or rather, in accordance with the covenant which was always one at varying epochs) those already appointed; whom God predestinated, having known before the foundation of the world that they would be righteous. And indeed the preeminence of the Church, like its origin and institution, makes it wholly unique,

[1] *Strom.* VII 92, 3—p. 65 Stählin; see Mayor's note *ad loc.*
[2] *ibid.* 99, 2—p. 70 Stählin.
[3] *ibid.* 92, 7—p. 65 Stählin.
[4] *ibid.* 104, 1—p. 73 Stählin.
[5] *ibid.* 106, 3—p. 75 Stählin.

surpassing all other things, having nothing like or equal to itself[1].'

Such passages as these justify the contention that the early Christians were unaware of a difference between the Church as a religious conception and the Church as a working institution. Funk, the learned Roman Catholic editor of the Apostolic Fathers, was giving away, from his point of view, more than he had any need to give away, when, in his notes on the third Vision of Hermas, he said that the tower was 'the Church—not that Church which embraces all Christians, good and bad, but the Church which contains none but the righteous, the true believers.' He was mistaken in saying, in his notes on the preceding Vision, that Clement of Alexandria, as well as Hermas, drew this distinction. It was nearer to the truth, when in a third note[2] he said, 'The author, as Harnack has observed, has here confounded the images of the true Church on earth and the Church triumphant in heaven': the author had never learned to separate them[3].

The Church and the Churches.

Perhaps the first result of this conception of the Church is to put the local communities of Christians in their right place with regard to the Church at large.

[1] *ibid.* 107, 2 foll.—p. 76 Stählin. It seems strange that in view of passages like these Harnack can maintain that at this point in the *Stromateis* Clement 'suddenly identifies' the ideal Church with the Catholic one, implying that the identification does not really express his views: 'he employed it simply in polemics, and not in positive teachings' (*Hist. of Dogma* II p. 80). It is perhaps still more strange that he can affirm that 'we have not the slightest evidence that his [Clement's] conception of the Church was of an...anti-heretical type' (*ibid.* p. 71 note).

[2] On Vis. III 7.

[3] Harnack very rightly says (*Hist. of Dogma* II 74 n. 1) that the expression 'invisible Church' is liable to be misunderstood, 'because it is apt to impress us as a mere idea, which is certainly not the meaning attached to it in the earliest period.'

There were, of course, Churches, as well as a Church. There was—to look no further than the New Testament—a Church in Corinth, a Church of the Thessalonians, a Church of the Laodiceans; there were Churches of Macedonia, Churches of Galatia, Churches of Asia, Churches of Judaea which were in Christ[1]. There was even such a thing as the Church in a single house. But the reason why the Church in the single house, or the Church of a single city, came to bear that name was not that it was a complete organization in itself, but because it was ideally an assembly representing the entire Divine society. 'The faith of Christians sees in every assembly of Christians gathered together in the Spirit the whole of Christendom, the people of God, the universal society. Upon these grounds every assembly of Christians, great or little, which meets in the name of the Lord, is called *Ecclesia*, the gathering of the New Testament people of Israel. The general assembly of all the Christians of the same place bears the name *Ecclesia*, because it represents, not an assembly of this local community, but an assembly of all Christendom (Israel). In the same way, an assembly of the community belonging to one house. Thus there is but one *Ecclesia*, the assembly of all Christendom; though this one Church has innumerable manifestations[2].'

[1] This mode of speaking is by no means confined to the New Testament. Origen, for example, constantly speaks of 'the Churches' as an aggregate, where we should more naturally speak of 'the Church.'

[2] Sohm *Kirchenrecht* p. 20, 21. We must, however, guard against the notion, which the language of Sohm and other writers would seem to encourage, that Christians were permitted to break up into little separate groups without forfeiting in one another's eyes their membership in the one Ecclesia. Our state of knowledge does not permit us to affirm on what principle the Ecclesia in a given house was so named, but we may be certain that it was not the principle of free secession. The New Testament bears sufficient evidence of the way in which schism was regarded, even when it took the negative form of habitual absence from the assemblies of the Church (Heb. x 25). In Cyprian's time there were some who argued, either on their own behalf, or more probably on behalf

If it were not for the history of the name, no one could have been surprised if the course of the developement of the conception of the Church had been reversed,—if Christians had begun by thinking of local associations, and then had massed them together into one. But this was not the way. Hort said that to each local Ecclesia St Paul ascribed a unity of its own, but that there was no grouping of them into partial wholes or into one great whole. 'The members which make up the One Ecclesia are not communities but individual men. The One Ecclesia includes all members of all partial Ecclesiae; but its relations to them all are direct, not mediate...There is no indication that St Paul regarded the conditions of membership in the universal Ecclesia as differing from the conditions of membership in the partial local Ecclesiae. Membership of a local Ecclesia was obviously visible and external, and we have no evidence that St Paul regarded membership of the universal Ecclesia as invisible, and exclusively spiritual, and as shared by only a limited number of the members of the external Ecclesiae, those, namely, whom God had chosen out of the great mass and ordained to life, those whose faith in Christ was a genuine and true faith. What very plausible grounds could be urged for this distinction, was to be seen in later generations: but it seems to me incompatible with any reasonable interpretation of St Paul's words[1].'

Nothing could be more just. The New Testament contains no hint that the visible Church, and the Churches which represent it, are not the august

of their theory of the validity of heretical baptism, from the text Matt. xviii 20, of which Sohm makes so much, and the Montanist Tertullian before him (*de Cast.* 7; *de Fug.* 14; *de Paen.* 10; *ad Ux.* II 8). Cyprian very cogently shews that such a claim was wholly contrary to the spirit and intention of the text (*de Unit.* 12).

[1] Hort *Christian Ecclesia* 168 f.

company of which glorious things are spoken. Quite the contrary; it is everywhere emphatically taught that membership in the visible Church carries all else with it, if only the members are true to what they receive. Baptism is no mere outward symbol, admitting to a society without religious value. It is incorporation into Christ. It washes away sin; it confers a new and higher life. By the laying on of hands which follows it, the Holy Ghost is given. The baptized from that time onwards are 'the saints.' The sacrament of the Broken Bread which they share together maintains not only their outward fellowship with each other, but their inward union with Christ. The society in which they meet together is the body of Christ[1]. For this reason the utmost reverence is to be paid to the sacred assembly. To despise it is sacrilege[2]. To break it up by divisions, factions, heresies, schisms, is the deadliest treason. Why is this so, unless the earthly Church is itself considered to be the house of God, the pillar and ground of the truth, in which every step is of incalculable importance[3]? If, as Sohm argues, Catholicism consists in treating the visible fellowship of believers as the true Church of Christ, then the Apostles themselves were Catholics[4].

The relation of the Churches to the Church became clearer, no doubt, in process of time than it was at the first, but at no period can any sign be discerned that the Churches were conceived of as independent and self-contained entities. 'Just as there had never been

[1] Sohm *Kirchenrecht* p. 22, n. 19, rightly rejects the view that when St Paul says that the Corinthian Church is σῶμα Χριστοῦ, his words should be rendered 'ye are *a* body of Christ.' All the attributes of the whole Church belong to each assembly.

[2] I Cor. xi 22.

[3] I Tim. iii 15.

[4] Father Tyrrell (*Life*, vol. II p. 62) appears to mean much the same when he makes the main difference between Catholicism and Protestantism to consist in believing or denying the Divine origin of the Church.

a time when the separate communities, before they became fully organized, were devoid of outside ministration or supervision, so there never came a period when the fully organized communities lived only to themselves[1].' It is not necessary to look beyond the Epistles of the New Testament itself to verify this assertion. However large a liberty of local developement was allowed by the apostolic founders, the liberty was bounded by a sense of duty not only to the founder himself, but to the rest of Christendom. The gifted Church of Corinth, disinclined to defer much to the judgement of St Paul, struck out ways of its own which were not in keeping with 'the traditions' which he had conveyed to it: the Apostle brings the Corinthians to their senses when he remarks, with severe irony, 'If any man think to be contentious, we have no such custom, nor the Churches of God'; and again, 'Did the word of God proceed from you? or did it come to you alone?' They belonged to a larger whole, to a fellowship coextensive with the preaching of the Gospel: it was an outrage that they, or any other Church, should behave in a way that threw them out of harmony with the rest of the society[2].

The sense of belonging to an oecumenical fellowship was inculcated not only by such apostolic injunctions as these, but also by the very actions done in common at every solemn meeting of the local Churches. It may be doubtful whether the *Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles* is a transcript from the life of any actual Christian community, but at any rate it does not represent the ecclesiastical conditions of an advanced period. The sacramental doctrine contained in it is of

[1] C. H. Turner, in the *Cambridge Medieval History*, vol. I p. 143.

[2] Harnack (*Hist. of Dogma* II p. 76) speaks of the contrast between 'the great Church' (it is the phrase of Celsus) and 'the Marcionite Church, the school sects, the Christian associations of all kinds, *and the independent Christians*.' It would be interesting to know where he finds evidence of the existence of these last. He gives no references.

a rudimentary kind. Nevertheless the thanksgiving which the little book suggests for use, when no prophet is at hand to extemporize, bears witness to the conception of an universal Church, to which the persons concerned belong and for which they care. 'As this broken bread was once scattered over the mountains, and was brought together and made one, so let Thy Church be brought together from the ends of the earth into Thy Kingdom.' 'Remember, O Lord, Thy Church, to deliver it from all evil and to perfect it in Thy love; and bring it together from the four winds, even the Church which is sanctified unto Thy Kingdom, which Thou hast prepared for it[1].'

The Church's title of 'Catholic.'

It was not long before the great unity thus indicated received the momentous epithet which denotes this character. As distinguished from the local assemblies which represented it, it was 'the Catholic Church.' 'Wheresoever the bishop appears, there let the multitude be, even as wheresoever Christ Jesus is, there is the Catholic Church[2].' Lightfoot has admirably pointed out the difference between the meaning of the epithet on this its first appearance in connexion with the word 'Church,' and the meanings which in the course of its long history it has acquired. 'In its earliest usages, as a fluctuating epithet of ἐκκλησία, "catholic" means "universal," as opposed to "individual," "particular." The Church throughout the world is called "catholic," just as the Resurrection of all mankind is called "catholic[3]." In its later sense, as a fixed attribute, it implies orthodoxy as opposed to heresy, conformity as opposed to dissent. Thus to the primary idea of extension are superadded also the ideas of doctrine and unity. But,' he rightly

[1] *Did.* 9, 10. [2] Ignatius *Smyrn.* 8.
[3] He has just given examples of this from Justin and Theophilus.

adds, 'this later sense grows out of the earlier. The truth was the same everywhere, "quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus." The heresies were partial, scattered, localized, isolated.' The epithet in fact carried with it the famous argument of a later time, 'Securus iudicat orbis terrarum.' It was in vain that an occasional attempt was made to turn the term itself into a note of sectarianism; its real significance was too obvious. 'Am I not a Christian?' asks the Marcionite in the dialogue of Adamantius. 'How can you be a Christian,' Adamantius answers, 'when you are not even content to bear the name of "Christian"? You are not called a Christian, but a Marcionite.' 'And you,' is the retort, 'say that you belong to the Catholic Church—you therefore are not Christians either.' 'If we assumed the designation of a man, you are right,' Adamantius replies; 'but if our title comes from our existing all over the world, how can it prejudice us[1]?' But the doctrinal connotation was already present in the mind of this writer. At the close of the second discussion, the neutral arbiter who has presided affirms his conviction that Adamantius has made out his case for One Almighty God, 'to whom of right is attached the Catholic Church, maintaining the correct dogma,' and he expresses a desire to be included in the flock[2].

No other Church recognized.

It must not be supposed that when the Church was called, in this later sense, the Catholic Church, the existence of other Churches was implied which were not Catholic. The language of the New Testament still held sway over men's minds, and they could not bring themselves to use the word 'Church' in the plural except in a local signification. It did not enter

[1] Adamantius I 8. [2] Adamantius II 22.

into their thoughts that there could be separate connexions and widely ramifying unions of Christians, to each of which the name of a Church might be given. Both on the one side and on the other such a use of terms would have been rejected. From our modern point of view we may speak of the Marcionite Church, or the Montanist Church, or the Novatianist Church, standing side by side with the Catholic Church, but this was not the nomenclature of early days. Each body of Christians in its turn claimed to be the Church, and by so doing denied the claim of the rest. Mention has been made of Clement's apparent concession of the term to heretics. But when he says that the heretics shut out the prophecies from 'their Church,' he no more recognizes that the heretics really form a Church than, if he spoke of 'their God' or 'their Christ,' he would recognize the existence of such beings. That there was only one Church, and never could be a second, was a belief firmly fixed in the minds both of Catholics and of those who broke away from them. It was inconceivable that there should be more than one elect people of God. 'What Church do you belong to?' Pionius was asked by an official better informed than most. 'To the Catholic Church,' the martyr answered; 'there is no other in the sight of Christ[1].'

The Montanist claim.

The Montanist Tertullian held as strongly to this conviction as the Catholic Tertullian had done. Not indeed that Montanism—or at least Montanism as Tertullian knew it—had a strong outward organization to oppose to that of the Catholic Church. It would no longer have been natural for Tertullian to begin a

[1] *Mart. Pionii* § 9.

description of the new system as he had begun his description of the old with a 'Corpus sumus[1].' Montanism could not dispense altogether with visible appliances, but it made little of them. With defective logic it retained much of Catholic practice, as well as of Catholic doctrine; but it erected no hierarchy to rival the hierarchy which it repudiated[2]. Nevertheless the 'spiritual Church' to which the great African transferred his allegiance was at least as indisposed to admit the existence of another as the Catholic Church ever was. The *psychici*, as he commonly calls the body which he had left, are not the Church. They have no right to the name, or to what the name carries with it. 'The Church, you say, has power to forgive sins. I acknowledge and determine the same, and still more emphatically, for I have the Paraclete Himself declaring in the new prophets, "The Church *can* forgive sin; but I will not do it."...What has [the giving of the keys to Peter] to do with the Church—that is to say, with *your* Church, O natural man?...The Church itself by rights and in principle is nothing else than the Spirit, in whom is the Trinity of the one Godhead, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. He gathers together that Church which the Lord composed of three; and thus the aggregate of those who agree in this faith are reckoned to be the Church by Him who formed and hallowed it. So it comes about that the Church will indeed forgive sins, but the Church of the Spirit, acting through the spiritual man, not the Church which consists in an aggregate of bishops[3].' Tertullian may vouchsafe for the moment to bestow the name of a Church upon the congregation of unspiritual men,

[1] *Apol.* 39: corpus sumus de conscientia religionis et disciplinae unitate et spei foedere.

[2] See K. Adam *Der Kirchenbegriff Tertullians* in Ehrhard and Kirsch's *Forschungen* (Paderborn, 1907) p. 216 foll.

[3] *De Pudicitia* 21.

upon a set of officials, but he does it with scornful irony; he does not really mean it.

It might have been thought that Tertullian had forestalled Luther in his emancipation from the imposing idea of the Catholic Church. Certainly he had the courage to break completely with it. Words could scarcely be found too strong to express his contempt and indignation towards it. The new conception of a spiritual Church, to which alone belonged the promises arrogated by the Catholics to themselves, was in many ways an attractive one. But it fell short of the conception of the German Reformer inasmuch as the Montanist Church was not a purely invisible union, the very existence of which was a matter of faith, and whose members were known only to God. A communion was established between the adherents of the new prophets. They proved themselves to be spiritual by recognizing the spiritual gifts which were displayed[1]. These constituted the true Church. To acknowledge the prophet was the practical test of Montanism, as acknowledging the bishop was of Catholicism.

Prophecy helped to establish episcopacy.

It is interesting to observe, in view of the Montanist reaction against the rigid machinery of the Church, how large a part prophecy had taken, in earlier days, in establishing that very system which it now aspired to overthrow. Nothing is more marked in the formation of the New Testament polity than the action of the Spirit through the prophets. It was through them that a Barnabas and a Saul were set apart for their apostolic work. It was by prophecies that went before on Timothy, or guided to him, that this genuine son of St Paul was ordained to a share in the task of his

[1] *De Monogamia* I: nos...quos spiritales merito dici facit agnitio spiritalium charismatum.

spiritual father[1]. The gift which qualified him for the task came to him through prophecy[2]. Clearly something of the same kind is intended when the Apostle reminds the elders of Ephesus that it was the Holy Ghost who had made them bishops in God's flock[3]:—the Holy Ghost had not only ratified their appointment by inward aids; He had nominated them to the office by the voices which spoke there and 'in every city[4].' It was in ways like these, among others, that the Church was historically founded on the apostles and prophets. Clement of Alexandria, reproducing earlier traditions, tells how St John went about Asia appointing to the sacred office 'one and another of those who were indicated by the Spirit[5].' The last recorded utterance of Christian prophecy before the Montanist revival was in the same direction. The martyr Ignatius was a prophet. When he visited the Church of Philadelphia, facts were studiously concealed from him which afterwards came to his knowledge, but in spite of the concealment his prophetic utterance went straight to the point. 'If some desired to mislead me, the Spirit is not misled, being from God; for He knoweth whence He cometh and whither He goeth, and He detecteth hidden things. I cried aloud when I was in the midst of you, I spake with a mighty voice, the voice of God, "Pay heed to the bishop, and to the presbytery and the deacons"...He in whom I am bound is my witness that I knew it not from human flesh. It was the Spirit that preached, saying thus, "Do nothing without the bishop[6]."' The phenomenon was not unique. It seems now to be generally believed that the establishment of the Jewish law, with its priesthood and its ritual, was the work of the Jewish prophets,

[1] I Tim. i 18, cp. Hort *Ecclesia* p. 181 foll. [2] I Tim. iv 14.
[3] Acts xx 28. [4] Acts xx 23.
[5] *Quis Dives* 42. Cp. Clem. Rom. xlii δοκιμάσαντες τῷ πνεύματι.
[6] *Philad.* 7.

although there were among them voices which protested against the formalism which attended the establishment. In a similar fashion we may surmise from the evidence before us that the developement of the Christian hierarchy was in great measure due, not to the intrigues of self-seeking presbyters and bishops, nor to the cravings of the natural man[1], but to the exhortations of Christian prophets, speaking by the word of the Lord and in the Spirit[2].

All ministries in the Church 'charismatic.'

It has become customary in recent years to contrast a charismatic ministry with one which is not charismatic. The antithesis, so far as the primitive Church is concerned, is a false one. No doubt there was a difference between ministries which were normally local and ministries of a more general character. There was a difference between ministries conferred by the direct action of the Spirit, calling whom He would to be apostles, prophets, and evangelists, and ministries conferred by the Church, when it elected, or when apostolic men appointed for it, bishops and deacons. But it is a mistake to speak of the first as charismatic and the second as not charismatic. All alike were considered charismatic,—the regular, settled ministries as well as the other. Probably in the case of such ministries as that of the prophet no act of ordination took place, while in that of the bishop ordination was, so far as we know, universal. But the belief was that spiritual grace was at least as truly bestowed in ordination as in any other fashion. Testimony to this belief is borne by the well-known language of the Pastoral Epistles,

[1] Sohm *Wesen und Ursprung des Kath.* p. 351.

[2] We may not forget, however, that the Roman Church, at any rate, in the first century believed that the foundation of the hierarchy was due to the instructions received from Christ by His Apostles (Clem. Rom. 42, 44). The two things are not incompatible.

where the writer reminds Timothy that the charisma of God, though it may have died down somewhat, is in him still, and in him by means of the laying on of the writer's hands[1]. The idea of ordination as a 'means of grace'—of a gift of grace bestowed for a lifelong ministry—could not be more clearly expressed.

That this view of the ministry was not universally held might perhaps be inferred from the incident which gave occasion for the Epistle of the Roman Clement. The Church of Corinth had rebelled against its presbyters. What was the reason of the rebellion we are not informed. We are not informed what was substituted for the deposed presbyterate. It might be surmised that the Church of Corinth still retained something of that charismatic disorder which St Paul had striven to reduce. At any rate it had not adopted in practice—whatever theory it may have professed—the belief in an indefeasible commission conferred by ordination. In like manner the Marcionites would seem not to have held that belief. Tertullian in a well-known passage describes their system—it is generally agreed that the Marcionites are the heretics in question—as earthly and merely human, because, among other enormities, 'their ordinations are hasty, frivolous, and revocable...One man is bishop today and another tomorrow; a man is deacon today and tomorrow a reader, today a presbyter and tomorrow a layman. They impose priestly duties upon laymen[2].' How far these conceptions spread in other directions we do not know, but they did not long continue, if they ever existed, within the Catholic communion[3].

[1] II Tim. i 6. Bishop Chase has endeavoured to shew that the laying on of hands here mentioned was the baptismal action of that kind, not that of ordination (*Confirmation in the Apostolic Age* 35 foll.). I cannot agree with him.

[2] *De Praescr. Haer.* 41.

[3] Harnack *Hist. of Dogma* II p. 89 affirms that Cyprian himself, in opposition to Callistus and other Roman bishops, held that 'the episcopal

The fact is that the Catholic communion invested everything that was done in the Church with a religious and spiritual significance. 'Helps, governments,' were ranked by St Paul among the gifts of the Holy Ghost to the Church, along with powers of healing and divers kinds of tongues[1]. The same Apostle, reckoning up the charismata of the body of Christ—not necessarily a complete list,—speaks of prophecy, ministry (diaconate in a wider than technical sense), teaching, exhortation, charitable giving, ruling, works of mercy[2]. St Peter does the like; 'As each man hath received *charisma*, minister the same one to another as good stewards of the manifold grace of God: if any man speak, let him speak as it were God's oracles; if any man minister (the word of diaconate again), let him do it as out of an ability which God supplieth[3].' Every movement of the sacred society was fraught with spiritual value. Nothing that was Christian could be considered secular, or, in the words of Tertullian, earthly and human[4].

office does not confer any indelible character.' It would be truer to say that he recognises that bishops may be deposed; so for that matter did early Roman bishops. But it was a long time before the distinction was emphasized between the office and the order.

[1] I Cor. xii 28.

[2] Rom. xii 6 foll. [3] I Pet. iv 10 foll.

[4] Sohm *Kirchenrecht* p. 108 foll. well shews that the local ministries were regarded as charismatic. The position taken up by this learned author is a strange one. He starts with the assumption, which he thinks unquestionable, that primitive Christianity was not Catholic. 'Es ist zweifellos, dass das Urchristentum nicht katholisch war' (*Wesen und Urspr.* p. 335). Yet, as against the historians who attribute the catholicizing of Christianity to Hellenic influences, he maintains that this catholicizing arose as a necessary consequence out of a factor contained in primitive Christianity, before the Hellenizing process began. The factor which had this momentous result was the identification of the Church of Christ with the historic organization of believers upon earth. Harnack *Constitution and Law of the Church* p. 176 says, 'Sohm's theory, with the exception of the Catholic view, is the most coherent and complete which has ever been put forward.' He admits that the 'Catholic' element was present in embryo as early as the Apostolic age (p. 245); but he takes a larger and truer view of what the word means than Sohm does.

Montanism may, indeed, have been largely justified in attacking the Catholic Church of the time as a psychical institution. It is easy for those who attach a religious value to sacramental forms to rest upon what is external, and to degenerate into an unspiritual condition. The false security which comes of saying, 'The temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord are these[1]' is not confined to the old dispensation. Revolts and Reformations may be required to awaken the Church to the peril. Nevertheless it is not the Catholic theory that is to blame; it is the ineffective hold upon the theory. There is nothing 'psychical' about the theory as discerned in the New Testament, where the outward symbols are indeed insisted upon, and highly prized, and spoken of as if they were the very things signified, but always with the consciousness that the things signified are beyond, and that only these give value to the means by which they are to be apprehended. The charismatic nature of every ministry, the spiritual power underlying every ecclesiastical action,—these are of the essence of the Catholic theory, and Montanism itself had nothing more spiritual to offer[2].

The Church the special sphere of the Holy Spirit.

This was, in fact, the principal attraction of the Church in early days: it was considered as the home of grace and sanctity, and therefore of salvation. In the Church, and in no other quarter, could men be sure of finding the Spirit of God. It was not indeed a part of the business of the earliest Catholic theologians to deny that the Holy Spirit was operative beyond the circle of the Christian Church. His work in creation, His work in the prophets and inspired teachers of Israel, were

[1] Jer. vii 4.

[2] It has long been observed how the Montanist movement passed off into a new legalism: Neander II 252.

fully recognized[1]. That the Divine Wisdom—to all intents and purposes identified with the Holy Spirit—worked in choice souls among the Gentiles, was a familiar thought[2]. But the special sphere of His manifestation was the Church. It was there that He shewed Himself by the gifts of prophecy and of healing, and casting out of devils, which lasted far into the second century and even into the third. His presence there was pledged. He 'came upon the Church[3],' like the flying eagle, to protect it with His wings all over the world. The Spirit, like dew from heaven, moistened the souls of men with the grace of baptism, and made one bread of them[4]. The Spirit, and the faith which the Spirit teaches, dwelt in the Church as in a goodly vessel, ever remaining young itself, and renewing the youth of the vessel in which it rests. 'This gift of God,' says Irenaeus, 'was entrusted to the Church, that all the members might receive of it and be made alive; and none are partakers of it who do not assemble with the Church, but defraud themselves of life. For where the Church is, there is the Spirit of God; and where the Spirit of God is, there is the Church and all grace[5].' The truly spiritual disciple, who receives the Spirit of God, judges all things, and is judged of none:—he judges the Gentiles and the Jews; 'he judges those who work division, being destitute of the love of God, and looking more to their own profit than to the unity of the Church, and for small and trifling causes cutting and breaking up the great and glorious body of Christ, and so far as lies in their power destroying it[6].'

It will be seen that Irenaeus' conjunction of the Spirit with the Church was very different from what is often ascribed to him. He had no idea of implying that any

[1] Swete *The Holy Spirit in the Ancient Church* p. 377 foll.
[2] See e.g. Justin *Apol.* II 10.
[3] Iren. *Haer.* III 11. 8.
[4] *ibid.* III 17. 2.
[5] *ibid.* III 24. 1.
[6] *ibid.* IV 33. 7.

knot of people who professed to have the Spirit had a right to consider themselves a part of the Church. Nor had Tertullian. Tertullian the Montanist made the Church and the Spirit equivalent terms. 'The Church, strictly speaking, is essentially the Spirit[1].' But this was his way of denying that the association of 'natural' men was the Church. It reproduced, in trenchant form, the half of what Irenaeus had said more guardedly. In his Catholic days Tertullian had stated the other half as trenchantly. When the candidate for baptism confesses his faith in the Holy Trinity, 'the mention of the Church is necessarily involved; for where the Three are, there is the Church, which is the body of the Three[2].'

It followed from this close connexion between the Spirit and the Church that life-giving sacraments were not to be looked for except within the pale. Irenaeus will not allow any efficacy to the Eucharist of separated bodies. The 'pure offering' of which Malachi prophesied is the Eucharist offered by the Church in a pure conscience and faith unfeigned, in firm hope, and in fervent love: 'and this pure offering the Church alone offers to the Creator. The Jews do not offer it; their hands are full of blood. Nor do any of the assemblies of the heretics,' for various reasons which Irenaeus proceeds to state in detail[3]. Tertullian fiercely repudiates the baptism of heretics. 'To us it was given,' not to them: 'heretics have no share in our religious system; the very fact that they are deprived of communion shews that they are altogether outside[4].' The heretics of Tertullian were real heretics, of whom it was no exaggeration to say, as he did, that their God and their Christ were not the same as those of the

[1] *De Pud.* 21.

[2] *De Bapt.* 6; see Lupton's note, and cp. Adam *Kirchenbegriff Tertullians* p. 92.

[3] *Haer.* IV 18. 1. [4] *De Bapt.* 15.

Catholics. But Cyprian applied the lesson to the schismatics of his time who were not strictly heretical. Their waters defiled instead of cleansing ; their baptism made men children of the devil[1]. Their sacrifices were false sacrifices[2]. Their bishops were no bishops[3], their martyrs no martyrs[4]. The censure is harsh, and its form repellent, but it bears witness to the fervour with which Cyprian, like others before him, believed in the Church as the unique repository of Divine grace[5].

The Church as Mother and Virgin.

No image is more frequently used to describe this gracious institution than that of the Virgin Bride and Mother. The image has been already encountered in studying the views of Hermas and of the Alexandrian Clement. It had its origin, of course, both in the New Testament and in the Old. It was probably reflected in the Valentinian doctrine which made the ideal Man and the ideal Church a wedded pair, from whose union great results proceeded. It connected itself with all mystical speculation about the relation between the male and female principles. 'The scripture saith, God made man, male and female,' we read in the earliest Christian homily extant ; 'the male is Christ and the female is the Church[6].' Origen takes up the parable. 'He who created man in His image at the beginning, being Himself in the form of God, made him male and the Church female, and gave them both a oneness according to the image ; and for the sake of the Church the Lord, her husband, left His Father, whom He saw when He was in the form of God, and left also His mother, being the son of Jerusalem which

[1] *De Unit.* 11. [2] *ibid.* 17.
[3] *ibid.* 10. [4] *ibid.* 14.
[5] It is well known that the African creed of his time ran 'credis in uitam aeternam et remissionem peccatorum per sanctam ecclesiam ?' *Epist.* lxx 2.
[6] II Clem. 14 ; cp. 12.

is above, and was joined unto His wife, His fallen wife here, and they two became here one flesh (because for her sake He also became flesh...), and they are now no more two, but one flesh, since it is said to the wife, "Ye are the body of Christ and members in particular." For Christ has no body of His own, apart from the Church which is His body[1].' 'As Adam and Eve,' he says elsewhere, 'were the parents of all men, so Christ and the Church are the progenitors of all good deeds and thoughts and words[2].' 'Great joy,' say the Churches of Lyons and Vienne, 'came to the Virgin Mother,' when some who had denied the faith recanted their denial, 'to receive again alive those whom she had brought forth dead[3].' The martyrs, who had been kind to their weaker brethren, 'departed with peace to God, not leaving grief to the Mother, nor faction and war to the brethren, but joy and peace and concord and love[4].' To Irenaeus, those who do not assemble with the Church are not partakers of the Spirit, and 'those who partake not of Him, are not nourished unto life from the breasts of the Mother, nor do they drink the clear fountain that proceeds from the body of Christ, but hew out for themselves broken cisterns[5].' 'Our one and only Father, God, lives,' cries Tertullian, 'and our Mother, the Church[6].' He cannot say 'Our Father' without implying the Church our Mother[7]. He approves of Marcion, where, following St Paul, he sees in Sarah, as contrasted with Hagar, the covenant 'which gendereth

[1] *In Matt.* tom. XIV 17 (Migne 640). The text is somewhat corrupt. The interpretation of Adam and Eve as foreshadowing Christ and the Church seems to have been at least as old as Papias; see Fragments 6 and 7 in Funk's numeration.

[2] *In Joh.* fragm. xlv (p. 520 Preuschen).

[3] ap. Eus. *Hist. Eccl.* V 1. [4] *ibid.* 2.

[5] *Adv. Haer.* III 24. 1; cp. IV 33 ex Virgine per fidem regenerationem. Cf. Eus. *H. E.* iii 22.

[6] *De Monog.* 7. [7] *De Orat.* 2.

above all principality and power and dominion,...which is our Mother, the Holy Church to which we are pledged[1].' It was from Tertullian that Cyprian learned to say that a man cannot have God for his Father who had not the Church for his Mother[2]. Novatian, as much as Cyprian, saw in the Church the Bride of Christ, adorned with all spiritual gifts by the Holy Ghost, and preserved by Him uncorrupt and undefiled in the sanctity of everlasting virginity and truth[3].

In spite of recognized imperfections.

The men who wrote in this fashion were not blind to the facts that confronted them. They recognized that the Church on earth did not answer completely to their ideal. If she was the house and temple of God, the temple was always in danger of being made into a den of robbers. Bad prelates turned her into a house of merchandise[4]. If she was Sion, Jerusalem, the City of God, the Holy Land, yet she might incur pollution and ruin as her antitypes had done; a ruler like Hezekiah might save her, and a ruler like Zedekiah destroy her[5]. There was no salvation outside of her: she was like the house of Rahab in the fall of Jericho, marked by the scarlet cord. 'Let no one deceive himself: outside this house, that is, outside the Church, no one is saved[6].' She was like the ark of Noah in the Flood, the only sure refuge from the universal destruction. But the ark itself contains not only Noah

[1] *Adv. Marc.* V 4.

[2] *De Unit.* 6; cp. *Epist.* lxxv 14 si autem sponsa Christi una est, quae est ecclesia Catholica, ipsa est quae sola generat Deo filios.

[3] *De Trin.* xxix (Fausset p. 107, 111). Virginity was generally ascribed to the Church on account of her pure doctrine, motherhood for her fertility and authority.

[4] Orig. *in Matt.* 750 (Migne); *in Joan.* t. x 23 (p. 195 Preuschen).

[5] Orig. *in Jer.* xlv 19 (p. 229 Klostermann).

[6] Orig. *in Jesu Nave* III 5.

and his family, but also a multitude of irrational animals, some of them still savage and untamed by faith[1]. The parable of the Tares in the Field, the parable of the Net which gathered of every kind, were applied long before Augustine's time by Callistus[2] and by Origen[3]. The Church is the treasury and garner of the Lord ; but in it the vessels of wrath are stored for the present with the vessels of mercy, and the chaff with the wheat[4].

Variations of discipline.

Yet the admixture of the evil with the good did not destroy these men's belief in the institution and its sanctity. There were varying views with regard to the limits of toleration. A more exacting standard was set up in some places than in others. Tertullian denounces Hermas for his laxity as 'the Shepherd of adulterers[5].' A Callistus felt himself empowered to forgive sins more freely than was allowed by a Hippolytus. A Cornelius and a Cyprian were less exclusive than a Novatian. But all were agreed in principle that the Church possessed the right to exercise discipline over its members, and was bound to exercise it. They were shocked at the absence of proper regulations among the sects. The Marcionites, if Tertullian is right, laid less stress than the Catholics upon the discipline connected with the sacraments. Their ways, he says, were without seriousness, without authority, without discipline. There was no distinction between catechumens and believers. 'They all come, and listen, and pray, together,—even heathens, if they happen to be there ; they will throw that which is holy

[1] This is worked out at length by Orig. *in Gen.* II 3 foll. But Hippolytus *adv. Haer.* IX 460 is very severe upon this comparison.

[2] Hippolytus *loc. cit.*

[3] On Jer. xxvii 25 (p. 215 Preuschen).

[4] Orig. *loc. cit.*

[5] *De Pud.* 20.

to the dogs, and their pearls—sham ones, it must be admitted—to the swine. Simplicity is their word for the overthrow of discipline ; our concern for discipline they call a corruption[1].' It is curious that these friends of simplicity, these foes of strict discipline, demanded of their converts that they should abstain from marriage and, as far as possible, from everything else that belonged to the material order, established by an evil Creator. Their church was a church of ascetics. Even the Montanist Tertullian took offence at it[2].

The Church has an authoritative discipline.

Nothing could be further from the mind of all early Christendom, whether Catholic or otherwise, than the idea that each Christian was an independent unit responsible only to God for what he did and for the views which he expressed. The New Testament itself, with all its vindications of spiritual liberty, is full of assertions of the duty of the individual to the community, and of the community to the individual. Submission on the one hand, vigilant oversight on the other, are demanded everywhere, beginning with the earliest Epistles of St Paul[3]. It is possible, perhaps, to trace changes in the working of the principle. In the New Testament, much of the internal discipline of the community is seen to be in the hands of the community at large. All Christians keep an eye upon each other. When a Christian goes

[1] Tert. *de Praescr.* 41. Marcion justified this manner of proceeding by Gal. vi 6 ; see Jerome's comment *ad loc.* Contrast the *Didache* 9, 'Let no one eat or drink of your Eucharist but those who have been baptized in the Lord's name, for the Lord said concerning this, Give not that which is holy unto the dogs.'

[2] Readers of Burkitt's lectures on *Early Eastern Christianity* (p. 125 foll.) will remember that he maintains that this was the rule of the Syrian Church. His quotation from Bardaisan on p. 184 does not bear out this view so far as the end of the 2nd century is concerned.

[3] I Thess. v 11 foll.

wrong, the whole local society to which he belongs deals with the case, and inflicts the punishment, and restores the offender on repentance. Naturally, however the officers of the Church must from the beginning have taken a leading part in all such action. In course of time, the management of discipline passes entirely into the hands of the bishops. It is their business to exclude from communion and to readmit to it[1]. But the theory never changed. There was never a time when the community exercised the power of discipline apart from its leading members. When the bishops came to exercise it, they did so in the name of the Church and with its authority. The authority was not disputed, although a Tertullian might protest against the hands in which it was lodged.

It is one of the main contentions of Dr Hort, in his lectures on the *Christian Ecclesia*, that the Apostles neither had nor claimed any authority over the Church, except what he calls 'a moral authority[2].' He does not deny that they wielded 'an ill defined but lofty authority in matters of government and administration,' but he maintains that it was the result of 'the spontaneous homage of the Christians' among whom they laboured, and that Scripture contains 'no trace of a formal commission of authority for government from Christ Himself.' No assertion made by such a man as Dr Hort can be set aside lightly, as destitute of foundation. But this assertion of his must be regarded as one of those subtle super-refinements which occasionally detract from the value of his work. He could at times be more than just to some aspect of the truth which the general feeling of the Church has not emphasized.

It is hard to see how the Divine authority of the Apostles can be denied in face of such direct

[1] See III John 10. [2] p. 84.

affirmations as that of St Paul, 'Though I should boast somewhat more abundantly of our authority which the Lord gave for your edification, and not for your destruction, I shall not be ashamed[1].' It is hard to see how it can be denied by those who accept the epilogue to the Fourth Gospel, with its charge to St Peter, 'Feed My sheep[2].' The position of a shepherd towards the flock cannot but be one of authority; and the Biblical history of the word brings this into bold prominence. The 'shepherds' of the Old Testament who are entrusted with the 'feeding' of God's flock are not the priests, nor the prophets, nor any whose primary duty is that of spiritual nurture. They are the Kings of the Chosen People,—whose office has, no doubt, a religious importance which ought never to be forgotten, but whose shepherding includes government in its widest aspect[3]. The innocent-looking designation of a 'pastor' is a more authoritative title than several others which Protestantism has resented.

Without any doubt, the conception of a pastorate in the Church has continued from the Apostles' days downwards. Not only are 'pastors and teachers' among the 'gifts' which St Paul enumerates as given to the Church by the Ascended Christ[4]. The Ephesian elders are charged to take heed to themselves and to the flock, in which the Holy Ghost has set them as bishops, 'to feed (or govern) the Church of God, which He purchased with His own blood[5].' The first Epistle of St Peter carries on the charge:—'Feed (or govern),' says the elder to the elders, 'the flock of God which is among you,...and when the Chief Shepherd shall appear, ye shall receive the crown of glory which fadeth not away[6].' The very warnings of

[1] II Cor. x 8; cf. xiii 10. [2] St John xxi 16.

[3] See, for instance, II Sam. v 2, Jer. xiii 18—20, xxiii foll. in connexion with xxii; Ezek. xxxiv, esp. 23, 24; Zech. xi esp. in view of 6.

[4] Eph. iv 11. [5] Acts xx 28. [6] I Pet. v 2 foll.

the New Testament against indulging the spirit of domination bear witness to the authority which might be thus abused. It is hardly necessary to heap together the New Testament passages which demand obedience and respect for the office-bearers of the Church, or which urge the office-bearers to see that they are obeyed, and that no man shall despise them. The injunctions of later books may be more explicit than those in the earlier, but the conception is the same. The tone of authority is as audible in the Epistles to the Thessalonians and to the Corinthians as in the Pastoral Epistles, in the Catholic Epistles as in those of Clement and Ignatius. The mild anarchy of early Christianity is a fiction of modern imaginations.

This discipline extends to doctrine.

There was no department in which the authority of the Church was more felt than in that of doctrine. This was natural enough. The whole existence of the society was based upon a fact—the fact of the resurrection of Jesus Christ. To bear witness to this fact at first hand was the primary function of the Apostles. But it was impossible that they should bear witness to it with any effect, unless at the same time they interpreted its meaning. They could not discharge their function without telling men who and what Jesus Christ was, and why He died, and what was become of Him. This was the nucleus of a theology to which they were guided by the Spirit which they had received ; and the New Testament shews us how the Apostles insisted upon the maintenance of this body of teaching. Whatever differences existed among them on certain points, upon this central doctrine they were wholly at one. 'I delivered unto you first of all,' St Paul says to the Corinthians, 'that which I also

received, that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures, and that He was buried and that He was raised up the third day according to the Scriptures.... Whether it were I or they, so we preach, and so ye believed[1].' Already this Apostolic teaching, which came to St Paul from others, and which he delivered to his converts, assumed a definite and recognizable shape. 'Thanks be to God,' he writes to the Romans, whom he had never seen, 'that ye obeyed from the heart that form of teaching unto which ye were delivered[2].' How determined he was to resist any departure from this common type of doctrine, which he and the rest of the Apostles taught, is seen from his vehement denunciation of the innovators in Galatia. 'As we said before, and I say now again, if any one be preaching to you a gospel beside that ye received, let him be anathema[3].'

The 'Deposit.'

Years before this great group of Epistles was written, St Paul had urged men to 'stand fast and hold the traditions' which they had been taught[4]. It was not strange if, as time went on, and the temptation to improve upon the traditions increased, his views became still more clearly defined. There are difficulties in the way of considering the Pastoral Epistles to be his, but it is not one of them that the writer treats the Christian revelation as a sacred trust, or deposit, committed to the Church and to its chief ministers, and not to be tampered with. 'O Timothy, keep the deposit.' 'Have an outline of the healthful words which thou hast heard from me....Keep the good

[1] I Cor. xv 3, 11, cp. xi 23.

[2] Rom. vi 17. Could the phrase be rendered, 'which ye received by tradition?'

[3] Gal. i 9; cp. II Cor. xi 3, 4 and Gal. ii 2, 9.

[4] II Thess. ii 15, iii 6.

deposit by the Holy Spirit which dwelleth in us[1].' 'The things which thou heardest from me,...the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be fit to teach others also[2].' A presbyter-bishop must be one who 'holdeth fast to the word which is faithful according to the doctrine, in order that he may be able both to exhort in the teaching that is healthful, and to convict those who speak against it[3].' Already the tremendous word is known, which is to designate the opponents of this sound teaching. 'A man that is an heretic, after a first and second admonition, refuse, knowing that such an one is perverted and sinneth, being self-condemned[4].'

The Deposit and the Succession.

Faithfulness to the sacred deposit became naturally one of the most obvious features in the early conception of the Church. The denial of any portion of the original faith, the admixture of anything extraneous with it, was considered to be treason against the society. To adhere to the Christian tradition was a supreme necessity. It is hardly needful to set forth at length how this idea dominated Christian thought during the period of the conflict with Gnosticism. The fact is universally recognized. Irenaeus was not the first to express the duty of loyalty to the tradition, though he gave a signal emphasis to it, and to the means of securing it[5]. 'The tradition of the Apostles is made manifest all over the world, and in every Church all who wish to see what is true are able to examine it.

[1] I Tim. vi 20, II Tim. i 13, 14. The use made of these passages by Vincent of Lerins *Comm.* 21, 22—and of Gal. i 9 in *Comm.* 8—is wholly justified.

[2] II Tim. ii 2.

[3] Tit. i 9 τοῦ κατὰ τὴν διδαχὴν πιστοῦ λόγου. [4] *ibid.* iii 10, 11.

[5] The argument from the succession of bishops had been urged before by Hegesippus; see Lightfoot *Clement* vol. I p. 202 foll., p. 328 foll.

We can reckon up those who were appointed bishops by the Apostles, and their successors down to our own days[1].' 'Obedience is due to the elders in the Church, who have succession from the Apostles...who, along with the episcopal succession, have received according to the good pleasure of the Father the sure gift of the truth (*charisma ueritatis certum*)...We must cleave to those who keep the Apostles' doctrine, and who, together with their rank as elders, shew sound speech and a conversation void of offence, for the confirmation and correction of others....Where the Lord's gifts,' such as Apostles, prophets, and teachers, 'are placed, there is the place to learn the truth, among whom is the ecclesiastical succession from the Apostles[2].' Supposing that the Apostles had esoteric doctrines to impart, as the Gnostic heretics affirmed, they would, Irenaeus says, have imparted them to the Churches which they themselves founded. 'They wished those whom they left as their successors, transmitting to them their own office as teachers[3], to be perfect and irreprehensible.' Irenaeus proceeds to his famous enumeration of Apostolic Churches, where the truth may be ascertained,—first and foremost in the Church of Rome[4].

It would be unfair to Irenaeus to credit him with believing in a transmission from bishop to bishop of a power of finding out the truth by personal inspiration. This is not the meaning of his *charisma ueritatis*. The truth is received by tradition, not evolved from an inner consciousness. It abides in the Apostolic Church, not in the line of bishops who govern it. But the

[1] Iren. *Haer.* III iii 1.

[2] *Haer.* IV xxvi 2, 4, 5.

[3] If I understand Harnack aright (*Hist. of Dogma* II p. 84 ; cp. p. 78), he takes *magisterium* here (as his translator does) to mean 'government.' Plainly the word represents διδασκαλία, as it always does.

[4] *Haer.* III iii 1 foll. It is to be observed that Irenaeus is driven in the first place to the argument from tradition by the heretics who refused the argument from Scripture, alleging secret traditions of their own.

bishops are the representatives of their Churches, and the responsible guardians of their traditions. The promised Spirit who dwells with the Church is ready to give them an understanding of the truths to which they are to bear witness, and to enable them to set forth those truths with power. Yet, even so, Irenaeus appeals to the general soundness of the bishops' judgement, and to their moral integrity, not merely to their privileged position. His conception is not that of a mechanical and guaranteed infallibility of office.

The view which Irenaeus formulated was adopted on every side. It was the text on which Tertullian based his famous *Praescriptio* against the heretics. The Apostles 'founded Churches in the various cities, from which other Churches borrowed the layers and seeds of faith and doctrine and still constantly borrow and thus become Churches. By this means they are themselves esteemed apostolic, as the offspring of the apostolic Churches...All are primitive, and all apostolic, the unity of all being proved by the peace which they share, and the title of brotherhood, and the hospitality which they shew to each other; for these privileges are demanded on no other ground than that of the one tradition of an identical religion[1].' 'If the Lord Christ Jesus sent the Apostles to preach, no other preachers are to be received, than those whom Christ instructed...What they preached...cannot be ascertained except through the same Churches which the Apostles themselves founded, preaching to them as well by the living voice as by their Epistles afterwards...We are in communion with the Apostolic Churches; there is no doctrinal difference. This is the testimony of the truth[2].' 'Let [the heretics] display the origins of their Churches; let them unroll the list of their bishops, in unbroken succession from the beginning, shewing that their first bishop was created and preceded by one of the Apostles,

[1] *De Praescr.* 20. [2] *ibid.* 21.

or of the apostolic men who continued with the Apostles.' That is the way with the Church of Smyrna and its Polycarp, the Church of Rome and its Clement. 'The heretics cannot do it, therefore they are not received into peace and communion by the Churches which are either directly or indirectly apostolic, because they are in no sense apostolic, and their religion is a different religion[1].'

If Tertullian seems to lose sight for the moment of the *charisma ueritatis* imparted to the bishops upon whose succession so much depends[2], this part of the doctrine of Irenaeus was emphasized by others. The errors of false belief shall be exposed, says Hippolytus, by 'none other than the Holy Ghost who has been transmitted in the Church. The Apostles received Him first, and imparted Him to those who had believed aright. We, their successors'—Hippolytus was himself a bishop—'who partake of the same grace and high-priesthood and teaching office, and are the accredited guardians of the Church, slumber not with our eyes, nor keep silence from right speech,...but endeavour to make a worthy return to God our Benefactor,...not being slack in the things entrusted to us, but accomplishing the measures demanded by our own times, and imparting ungrudgingly to all men whatsoever the Holy Ghost shall bestow on us. We do not only explain and expose the things of others; but whatsoever the Truth Himself, having received it of the grace of the Father, ministered unto men, those things we preach boldly, declaring them by the spoken word, and testifying the same in writing[3].' There can be no question about the views of Hippolytus.

[1] *De Praescr.* 32.

[2] See however *de Praescr.* 22, 28 for the part of the Holy Spirit in the teaching.

[3] Hipp. *c. Haer.* i *prooem.* (Migne p. 3020). It is the special temptation of historians of opinion to magnify differences of expression and to seize upon

The succession to which Clement of Alexandria, at the same date, appeals, is not a succession in episcopal office. Much has been made by Protestant writers, of the difference between his attitude in this respect and that of others of his age. But the difference can easily be exaggerated[1]. Clement, like everyone else, believed that the episcopate was instituted by the Apostles. It is he who tells of the activity of St John in this direction[2]. He speaks of Peter and James and John choosing James the Just to be Bishop of Jerusalem[3]. He speaks of the Lord after His resurrection as delivering *gnosis*—the full Christian knowledge—to James the Just and John and Peter, who delivered it in turn to the rest of the Apostles, and the rest of the Apostles to the Seventy, of whom Barnabas was one[4]. 'This is the *gnosis*,' he declares, 'which has come down to us by unwritten tradition from the Apostles by a succession consisting of few steps[5].' The steps which he traces are those of specially qualified teachers in various quarters, not the occupants of a particular see. A man might well take the one line of argument without disapproving of the other. There is an element of fancifulness, no doubt, in Clement's account of the transmission of the Christian doctrine, but he insists as urgently as Irenaeus himself upon the necessity of

anything that may serve as a new point of departure. In such a spirit Harnack speaks of these words of Hippolytus as marking 'an immense advance beyond the conception of Irenaeus' (*Hist. of Dogma* II 71 note). If there is such an advance, it is in the claim to *ἀρχιερατεία*, not where Harnack places it, in respect of doctrine. Neither Hippolytus nor any other ancient Catholic bishop claimed to hold the position of the Apostles as an original fountain of Christian doctrine.

[1] See Batiffol's excellent study, *Le cas de Clément d'Alexandrie*, in his *Église Naissante et le Catholicisme* p. 295 foll.

[2] *Quis Dives* 42.

[3] *Hypotyp.* fragm. 10—p. 198 (Stählin).

[4] *Hypotyp.* fragm. 13—p. 199 (Stählin).

[5] *Strom.* VI 61, 3—p. 462 (Stählin).

adhering to the apostolic tradition preserved in the Church alone[1].

Whatever may have been the peculiarities of Clement's opinion on the subject, his disciple Origen at any rate reverts to type. If, as has often been observed, he devotes no section of his *Summa Theologiae* —the *De Principiis*—to the doctrine of the Church, it was because he was conscious of no differences of opinion about it. As Origen had ceased to ask for the truth among the heathen, after he had learned to look for it to Christ, so, he tells us, there was but one quarter to turn to among professing Christians. 'There are many who suppose that they think the things of Christ, but certain among them think differently from those who were before them. But the Church's teaching is preserved, being transmitted by orderly succession from the Apostles, and continuing to this day in the Churches. Therefore that alone is to be believed to be the truth, which is wholly in keeping with the apostolic tradition of the Church[2].' Again, 'To those who believe the Bible to be no work of men, but to have been composed by inspiration of the Holy Ghost, by the will of the Father, through Jesus Christ, and so to have come down to us, we will indicate the methods [of interpretation] which commend themselves, holding fast the rule of the heavenly Church of Jesus Christ which follows the succession of the Apostles[3].' Batiffol, in quoting the former of these passages, is

[1] See his account of his own teachers, and of their relation to the Apostles, in *Strom.* I 1 (Stählin p. 8 foll.). For what he means by *gnosis* and its relation to tradition, see *Strom.* VII 10 (Stählin p. 41, Mayor-Hort p. 96). In this passage Clement speaks of knowledge as coming ἐκ παραδόσεως κατὰ χάριν Θεοῦ, which is not unlike Irenaeus' *charisma ueritatis*, though it is not confined to the holders of an office.

[2] *De Princ.* praef. 2. The work, as a whole, exists only in the Latin translation of Rufinus; but there is no reason to suspect Rufinus of tampering here.

[3] *De Princ.* IV 2, 2 (9)—p. 308 (Koetschau).

justified in saying that it might have been taken straight out of Irenaeus[1].

The Rule of Faith.

One great phrase, repeated with variations, resounds through all the writings of the period under consideration. It is the Rule of Faith, the *regula ueritatis*, the κανὼν ἐκκλησιαστικός, the κήρυγμα τῆς ἐκκλησίας. From no pen does it run more frequently than from that of Clement of Alexandria. Emancipated as his spirit was, he had no notion of the Christian Church as a region in which every teacher and every learner was at liberty to explore independently and to set forth the results without control. All Christians were to be guided by the Rule. Attempts have been made to interpret the phrase in a narrow fashion. The *regula ueritatis* has been held to mean the baptismal creed. Undoubtedly the baptismal formula,—as ancient as the Gospel according to St Matthew, and found in the *Didaché*,—and the baptismal creeds of various Churches, into which that formula naturally expanded, were never far from the thoughts of the writers who used the phrase ; but the baptismal creed and the *regula ueritatis* are not convertible terms[2]. In revulsion from this narrow interpretation, scholars have attempted to prove that the *regula* consisted in nothing less than the Canonical Scriptures as a whole. This interpretation is at once too definite and too loose. A careful study of the phrase, as found in Irenaeus, Tertullian, Hippolytus, Clement, Origen, Cyprian, Novatian, Dionysius of Rome, shews that it means the teaching of the Church as a whole, the Catholic faith,—generally with a reference to the Holy Trinity. Sometimes it is the

[1] *Église Naissante* p. 372.

[2] The whole of Harnack's argument in *Hist. of Dogma* II 26 foll. is vitiated by this assumption.

Catholic faith as summed up in the creed ; sometimes it is the Catholic faith as it lies in the Sacred Scriptures ; but always it is the faith as known and taught in the universal Church, the same everywhere. It is the traditional testimony, borne by genuine Christendom, to its Founder and His doctrine. From this no deviation could be allowed[1]. The proclamation of it was the very purpose of the Church's existence, and without it the Church would cease to be.

Unity of the Church.

That the unity of the Churches of Christendom was never complete does not detract from the dignity or the truth of the conception. Communications were imperfect, even within the Roman Empire ; and there were Churches which lay beyond it. Not all the Churches advanced at an equal rate of progress. Some were left behind others in the course of their developement. There were many differences of practice between one Church and another. Probably there were differences of doctrine on particular points. Most of the leading men were willing to make allowance in these things, though some were not. When Victor attempted to make the Roman method of calculating Easter a law for Christendom, and excommunicated those who would not accept it, he encountered the resolute opposition of Polycrates and the

[1] The use of the phrase by Irenaeus and Novatian forms the subject of an interesting paper by Prof. Ammundsen in the *Teologisk Tidsskrift* for 1912, of which he gives a résumé in the *Journal of Theol. Studies* for July 1912. Prof. Ammundsen is perhaps a little too unwilling to see signs of a creed behind the references to the *regula*. It may be interesting to point out that the meaning given above is clearly the meaning intended by Augustine in describing the dream which comforted his mother concerning him ; *Conf.* III 19 *uidit enim se stantem in quadam regula lignea...uidit me iuxta se in eadem regula stantem* ; VIII 30 *stans in ea regula fidei.*

Churches of Asia and the East[1], and the remonstrances of Irenaeus and the Churches of Gaul. A great number of bishops wrote to him, urging him to 'think of peace and of unity and charity towards neighbours.' Irenaeus argued that diversity in this matter was even useful; 'the variation with regard to the fast,' he said, 'commends the agreement of the faith[2].' When Stephen contended with the African and Asiatic Churches over the rebaptism of heretics, Cyprian did not demand that Stephen or others should adopt his views; but 'that each bishop should do what he thinks right, having complete liberty to form his own judgement[3].' 'He saw and thought,' says Augustine, summing up the controversy, 'that men could think differently without loss to charity[4].' There were limits, however, to this liberty. Where the fundamentals of the common faith were touched, there could be no laxity. A story is recorded by Eusebius which has a curiously modern tone about it, and which is not without pathos. The aged Marcionite, Apelles, fell into controversy with Rhodon, a disciple of Tatian. Getting the worst of the argument, he pleaded 'that it is not fair to examine a man's convictions, but that each should be allowed to remain in the form of faith which he had adopted; for he endeavoured to shew that all those who have hoped in the Crucified will be saved, if only they are found engaged in good works[5].' If Apelles had been content to hold a lay position, perhaps no one would have censured his belief; but it was impossible that a man should be recognized as a teacher, maintaining the opinions which he held about the Old Testament.

[1] Including Osrhoene, which was then outside the Roman Empire. Cp. the reference of Dionysius of Alexandria to the attitude of the Churches of Syria, Arabia, and Mesopotamia in the Novatianist controversy (Feltoe *Dion. Al.* p. 45).

[2] Eus. *Hist. Eccl.* v 24.

[3] *Epist.* lxxiii 26.

[4] *De Bapt. c. Donat.* v 23, cp. Cypr. *Sent. Episcoponum* praef.

[5] Eus. *Hist. Eccl.* v 13.

The time came when the unity of the Churches was deliberately promoted by means of synods and councils,—promoted also by the ever-growing disposition of the Roman Church to supervise and to direct. But the experience of travelled Christians at quite an early date shewed that the unity was real. Ignatius found it to be so, in his progress from Syria to Rome. Hegesippus, in the middle of the second century, journeying from his native Palestine to Rome, made it his business to interview as many bishops as he could, and 'heard the same doctrine from them all[1].' He recorded that it was 'the unerring tradition of the apostolic preaching[2].' Abercius, a few years later, made a similar tour. He visited Rome, in the Christian desire 'to see the queen'—doubtless the Church of the imperial city—'in her golden vesture and her golden shoes.' The people of Rome were bright with 'the seal' which marked them. He saw 'the plain of Syria and all the cities.' He 'passed beyond the Euphrates and saw Nisibis.' Taking St Paul for a companion, he 'found associates everywhere.' Faith introduced him everywhere, and everywhere set before him the same sacred food, and good wine with his bread. From east to west, and from west to east, the Apostolic faith proved to be a passport for Abercius, and he was at home at the Eucharist in every Church[3]. The affirmation of Irenaeus was not beyond the truth, when he said that the same doctrine was taught throughout the world, in Germany and in Spain, as in Egypt and the East, by the ablest leaders in the Church and by the lowliest[4].

It is very possible that, as time went on, more stress

[1] Eus. *Hist. Eccl.* iv 22.

[2] *ibid.* iv 8.

[3] The inscription may be found in Lightfoot's *Ignatius* vol. I p. 480, Kaufmann's *Jenseitsdenkmäler* p. 79, Preuschen's *Analecta* in Krüger's *Quellenschriften* Heft VIII p. 25, and other places.

[4] *Haer.* I 10. 2.

was laid than at the outset upon the contents of the faith and less, in proportion, upon the believing habit of soul. For the purposes of unity and fellowship it was easier to reckon by notes which were comparatively external,—by orthodoxy in profession, by conformity in practice. This was, it may be admitted, to some extent a secularization of Christianity. But on the one hand the Church and its best teachers never ceased to insist upon the life of faith and upon personal devotion to the Lord Jesus Christ; and on the other hand it is impossible to point to a period when all that was asked of Christians was the expression of a subjective faith. It was always required that they should believe certain truths about God and Christ, and should perform certain acts by which fellowship with the society was established. In the common acknowledgement of these truths, in the open performance of these acts, the Church found a safeguard and an encouragement for the inward fellowship of the Spirit.

It would be of great interest if one of our indefatigable explorers could find for us, in the sands of Egypt or the caves of Eastern Turkestan, a book or two by Marcionite or other dissident Christians of the early days, expressing their views upon the subject of the present enquiry. To a certain extent the Montanist writings of Tertullian provide what we desire; but they are for the most part directed against particular details in the discipline of the despised Church, and only incidentally throw light upon the conception of the Church as a whole. Yet it is of more importance, after all, to know what Catholic churchmen themselves thought of the system to which they belonged. Here we are well supplied. The testimony is ample, and it is consistent. Whatever variations may be discerned, in accordance with the idiosyncrasies of particular authors, the main outlines of the conception are the same. Alike at Rome and at Alexandria, in Africa and

in the East, men believed in a great spiritual community, founded by Christ, through His Spirit working in His Apostles, to which all the promises of the Old Testament were attached. This community was necessarily unique. In it, and in it alone, the gifts and graces of the Spirit of Christ were to be looked for. In spite of human imperfections, it was guided and permeated in every part by the Spirit. Nor was this community an intangible thing. It was a reality of experience, embodied in a practical discipline. The society was well known and unmistakeable. Its doctrine was everywhere the same ; its worship, with rich diversity of forms, centred round one Eucharistic memorial. It had an organized hierarchy for worship and for the pastorate of souls. This hierarchy maintained union between the local branches, and did so in the name and by the authority of Christ. However far back the history is traced, no date can be assigned, however roughly, for the appearance of Catholicism in the Church. The Church was Catholic from the outset.

ESSAY II

THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY IN THE APOSTOLIC AND SUB-APOSTOLIC PERIODS

J. A. ROBINSON, D.D.

SUMMARY

In this Essay (1) the theory of 'Charismatic' ministries is examined and corrected, (2) Lightfoot's exposition of the origin of the Threefold Ministry is confirmed, (3) an attempt is made to indicate the essential significance of this Threefold Ministry.

(1)

Explanations of St Paul's language proposed in the light of the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* must be tested by a closer attention to the context of the passages. The Teaching merely suggests a peculiar state of things within its own sphere. The New Testament is not explained by it, and still points to a different conception of Church and Ministry.

(2)

This conception is that which Lightfoot (who wrote 15 years before the Teaching was discovered) formed directly from the New Testament—viz. that the New Testament already shews a permanent ministry being instituted by the divinely commissioned authority of the Apostles: first Deacons, then Presbyter-Bishops were appointed; and the lines were laid down along which the second century 'Episcopate' would presently come into being.

(3)

This judgement of Lightfoot's, questioned by the 'second thoughts,' is confirmed by the 'third thoughts' of criticism. The stages of evolution have become plainer; so also has the idea itself which was evolved. This generation with its yearning for unity has gained in power to understand how the historic threefold ministry stands for the unity of the whole Church.

II

THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY IN THE APOSTOLIC AND SUB-APOSTOLIC PERIODS

Forty-nine years have gone by since Lightfoot wrote his famous essay on the early history of the Christian Ministry. These years have been fruitful in discovery and research. Some new documents have been brought to light: many documents that had lain neglected have been re-edited and made generally accessible. Criticism has been busy, sifting and dating these: rival theories have offered to interpret all the evidence afresh. Many are asking to-day, What has been the issue of all this re-investigation? How does the matter stand? What is the verdict of history in the light of the newest knowledge of the facts? The question is asked with anxiety: for it is rightly felt that much may depend on the answer.

It has seemed to the present writer that the most useful contribution he can make to the discussion of this question is, first, to pass in review a particular conception of the distribution of ministerial functions in the primitive Church, which originated with the discovery of the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* some thirty years ago, and has become increasingly popular from that time to this; and, secondly, to enquire whether, or to what extent, the view of the developement of the threefold ministry which Lightfoot expounded in the earlier part of his essay requires to be abandoned or modified in consequence of more recent accessions

of evidence. A few words may be added as to the bearing of the results of such a review on the problem of Church Order in the present day.

1. *The Theory of 'Charismatic' Ministries.*

What has been the influence of the discovery of the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* upon the problem of the developement of the early Christian Ministry? The Teaching was first published in 1883; and a new theory suggested by it was put forth by Dr Harnack with remarkable rapidity in the *prolegomena* to his edition of it in the *Texte und Untersuchungen* in 1884. This theory has been widely accepted either wholly or in part by subsequent writers, and is maintained by its author with but slight modifications in his *Constitution and Law of the Church in the first two centuries*, published in 1910. Dr Harnack had been prepared for the fresh consideration of the whole subject by a task which he had set himself a few years before; namely the translation into German, together with critical observations, of Dr Hatch's *Lectures on the Organisation of the Early Church*. The new material offered by the Teaching gave no support to Dr Hatch's theory, but it stimulated investigation with a view to such a re-statement as should find a place for the facts to which he had called attention as well as for others which had long been recognized. The picture of a Christian community drawn in the Teaching was an unexpected presentation of various elements which had been observed in isolation before, but had not hitherto lent themselves to combination. Light seemed to break on figures and objects which had been but dimly discerned, and many riddles found a promise of solution[1].

[1] It will be well at once to say that what follows was written entirely without reference to the view of the composition of the Teaching which I have put forward in the *Journal of Theological Studies* (Vol. XIII No. 51);

This fresh glimpse into the early days, so Harnack explained, shewed us a most important moment in the Church's developement. A teaching ministry—Apostles, Prophets and Teachers—was on the point of passing from its ancient and supreme authority, and bequeathing its honours and influence to the administrative class of Bishops and Deacons. The former had belonged to the whole of Christianity, and was only in part and occasionally localized: the latter had never been anything but the local executive of a particular community. The former was a 'charismatic' ministry, of direct Divine appointment in every instance: the latter were officials chosen by the community to transact its affairs in certain departments. The former were rulers of the Church in virtue of their function as 'speakers of the word of God': the latter were local officers with no status outside their own borders. At the moment when the Teaching was written the 'charismatic' ministry was shewing signs of decay: it was necessary to uphold its authority by exaggerated language, and to give practical directions whereby false claimants could be readily detected and dismissed. The official ministry on the other hand received reinforcement on the general ground that it discharged the same functions as the Prophets and Teachers, and must therefore be honoured equally with them. In other words the twin functions of teaching and ruling were on the point of passing over to the local authorities of the community.

Before we go further into details it will be well to have before us the relevant portions of the Teaching itself. At the close of his formulae for the thanksgivings and prayers of the Eucharist the writer proceeds thus:

indeed it was the present study which led to the investigations there recorded. The arguments which are here put forward will only be strengthened, if further criticism shall confirm my judgement as to the historical value of that remarkable book.

(c. 10 *ad fin.*) But the prophets permit ye to give thanks as much as they will.

(c. 11) Whosoever therefore shall come and teach you all these things that are aforesaid, him receive: but if he himself that teacheth turn and teach another teaching, so as to overthrow, hear him not; but if it be to add righteousness and knowledge of the Lord, receive him as the Lord.

Now concerning the apostles and prophets, according to the command of the Gospel, so do ye. And let every apostle coming unto you be received as the Lord; but he shall not stay, save for one day; and if there be necessity, a second also: but if he stay three days, he is a false-prophet. And when the apostle goeth forth, let him take nothing save bread till he find lodging: but if he ask for money, he is a false-prophet.

And every prophet speaking in the spirit ye shall not try nor judge: for all sin shall be forgiven, but this sin shall not be forgiven. But not every one that speaketh in the spirit is a prophet; but only if he have the ways of the Lord: by their ways therefore shall be known the false-prophet and the prophet. And every prophet appointing a table in the spirit shall not eat thereof: otherwise he is a false-prophet. And every prophet teaching the truth, if he doeth not the things that he teacheth, is a false-prophet. But every prophet, proved and true, doing somewhat for a worldly mystery of the church, but not teaching to do what he himself doeth, shall not be judged of you: for with God he hath his judgement: for after this manner did the ancient prophets also. But whosoever shall say in the spirit, Give me money, or other things, ye shall not hear him: but if for others that are in need he command you to give, let no man judge him.

(c. 12) And let every one that cometh in the name of the Lord be received, and afterwards when ye have proved him ye shall know: for ye shall have understanding, right and left. If he that cometh be on a journey, aid him as much as ye can: but he shall not stay, save only two or three days, if there be necessity. But if he desire to settle with you, being a craftsman, let him work and eat: but if he have not a craft, according to your understanding provide ye that he live not in idleness with you as a Christian: but if he be not willing so to do, he is a Christ-trafficker: beware of such.

(c. 13) But every true prophet, desiring to settle with you, is worthy of his meat. Likewise a true teacher, he also is

worthy as the labourer of his meat. Every firstfruit therefore of the produce of winepress and threshing-floor, the firstfruit of oxen and of sheep, thou shalt take and give to the prophets: for they are your highpriests. And if ye have not a prophet, give it to the poor. If thou make a batch of bread, take the firstfruit and give it according to the commandment: likewise when thou openest a jar of wine or oil, take the firstfruit and give to the prophets: and of money and of raiment and of every possession take the firstfruit, as may seem good to thee, and give it according to the commandment.

Then, after brief instructions concerning the Sunday Eucharist and its preliminaries of confession or reconciliation, he goes on:

(c. 15) Appoint therefore for yourselves bishops and deacons worthy of the Lord, men that are gentle and without covetousness and true and proved: for they also minister to you the ministry of the prophets and teachers. Therefore despise them not; for they are your honoured ones together with the prophets and teachers.

These passages contain all the references in the Teaching to Christian ministers: but we must add to them a verse from the earlier part of the book (c. 4):

My son, him that speaketh to thee the word of God thou shalt remember night and day; and thou shalt honour him as the Lord: for from whence the Lordship is spoken of, there the Lord is.

With these passages of the Teaching before us we may proceed to a closer examination of the new conception of the origins of the Christian Ministry. Certain points have appeared to stand out prominently in the light which has been freshly cast upon the early history.

1. Apostles, Prophets, and Teachers form the triad of the Christian Ministry in the earliest period. Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons have no connexion with these, though some of the functions of the former class pass over in time to members of the latter class.

2. Apostles, Prophets, and Teachers were what they were in virtue of a 'charisma,' or special endowment of the Holy Spirit, which marked them out for their ministry and inspired them in the exercise of it. This 'charisma' was the direct gift of God, not mediated in any way by man, and beyond all challenge: its existence was self-evident: it was its own continual justification.

3. This 'charisma' was essentially a *Lehrgabe*, a gift of teaching, a power to declare 'the word of God.' As 'the word of God' was the ultimate law of the Christian Church, it follows that those who possessed this 'charisma' (οἱ λαλοῦντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ) were the authoritative rulers of the Church.

4. Whereas Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons were at the outset a purely local institution, Apostles, Prophets, and Teachers moved freely from one community to another, having everywhere their due recognition on the ground of their 'charisma.' They thus formed the most important bond between the many communities of the universal Church, and were the main cause of the general uniformity of its developement.

The *locus classicus* for the triad of Apostles, Prophets, and Teachers is I Cor. xii 28 ff.; 'And some hath God set in the church, first apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly teachers, then miracles, then gifts of healing, helps, governments, kinds of tongues. Are all apostles? are all prophets? are all teachers? are all workers of miracles? have all gifts of healing? do all speak with tongues? do all interpret? But covet earnestly the greatest gifts.' From this passage, it is said, we learn that Apostles, Prophets, and Teachers hold a definite position apart from all other members of the Church and in a definite order of precedence. Moreover they are directly appointed by God, and their service is for the whole Church and is not restricted to a local

community : 'God hath set (*or* appointed) them in the church.' That these are the only members of the Church whose 'charisma' gives them personal authority, status, and precedence is shewn (1) by the fact that the terms which follow in St Paul's list are impersonal—'miracles, gifts of healing, governments, kinds of tongues'; and (2) by the cessation of the definite numeration—i.e. not 'fourthly' and so on, but 'then... then.'

A similar classification occurs in another Epistle, which whether Pauline or not certainly represents a somewhat later stage in the developement. In Eph. iv 11 f. we read : 'And he himself gave some apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers, for the perfecting of the saints for the work of ministry, for the building of the body of Christ.' This passage, it is argued, confirms the 'charismatic' character of this early ministry ; for the words 'He himself gave' correspond to the phrase 'God hath appointed in the church.' These ministers are the gift of Christ, and not the choice of man. Moreover since the 'pastors' probably represent the local ministry (the 'presbyter-bishops' who 'feed the Church of God,' Acts xx 28), it is instructive to observe that they are coming into prominence and are now closely linked with teachers. The original triad is yet further developed—perhaps more in appearance than in fact—by the insertion of the term 'evangelists,' which suggests that already the term 'apostles' is becoming narrowed and confined to the Twelve and St Paul.

It is the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* that has fixed our attention upon these two passages, and has taught us their value. For the Teaching shews us Apostles as figures familiar to the churches at a time when the Twelve and St Paul have passed away. Moreover the Teaching links together first Apostles

and Prophets, and then Prophets and Teachers, shewing that the triad 'Apostles, Prophets, and Teachers,' in its due order, was in the writer's mind. Further, these ministers are seen to be essentially non-local, though a Prophet or a Teacher (but not an Apostle) might if he chose settle in a particular community, and would in that case exercise commanding authority therein by reason of his 'charisma' as 'a speaker of the word of God.' The special dignity which attaches to these ministers is seen most clearly in the case of the Prophet. The Prophets celebrate the Eucharist, and are free from the obligation to use the prescribed formulae. If they have been duly proved, their messages and their actions are henceforth to be accepted without criticism. Firstfruits are to be given to them; 'for they are your highpriests.' If there were no Prophets in a community, the local ministry would necessarily undertake the ordinary responsibilities of leadership: and their highest title to honour is that 'they also minister unto you the ministry of the Prophets and Teachers.' The community is bidden to appoint for itself its local ministers; but Apostles, Prophets, and Teachers were 'charismatic persons' (*Charismatiker*), whom the community can prove and recognize, but cannot appoint.

This theory of a 'charismatic' ministry of Apostles, Prophets, and Teachers, belonging to the Church in general and exercising authority over any community which they might visit or in which they might choose to settle down, superseding the local officials who yet wait in the background ready to inherit the highest honours when 'charismata' become rare and at last altogether cease, is an exceedingly attractive theory. It does not indeed throw any fresh light upon the most interesting problem of the post-apostolic age, the developement of the monarchical episcopate; but it offers an intelligible account of the condition of many

churches in which that developement may have been for some time delayed, and it provides a unifying element after the great Apostles are gone, which may help to explain the general uniformity which ultimately prevailed throughout the widely separated communities of the universal Church. It is not open to objection on the ground that it conflicts with any reasonable view of the early history of the official ministry, such for example as Bishop Lightfoot's : for though it relegates that ministry for a time to a somewhat humble position, it only delays the process by which it attained its full honours. If the theory is to be dismissed, it can only be for the reason that the evidence on which it has been made to rest breaks down altogether on cross-examination.

It will appear at once that the triad of Apostles, Prophets, and Teachers has but a slender attestation. The recognition of Teachers as a definite class gets a little support from Acts xiii 1, 2, where 'prophets and teachers' are found in the church at Antioch. But 'teachers' is a term which we should be inclined to regard as connoting a function rather than a definite position. And the passage in the Epistle to the Ephesians points this way, in its collocation of 'pastors and teachers,' both of which words naturally describe function rather than status.

Moreover the discrepancy in the two Pauline lists is too considerable to be explained away. The Teaching must on any shewing be later than the Epistle to the Ephesians ; and if the triad had already undergone developement, it must surprise us to find it again intact in its original shape. Is it not more reasonable to say that 'apostles and prophets' is a natural grouping (cf. Eph. ii 20, iii 5), and so also 'prophets and teachers' in certain circumstances (as in Acts xiii 1) ? In the Teaching both groups appear, though the triad as such does not. In fact the triad appears nowhere except in I Cor. xii 28.

Again, are we justified in laying stress on the fact that St Paul says 'first, secondly, thirdly,' but does not continue with 'fourthly,' and so on? Is it not quite natural to stay the exact enumeration at the third item of a considerable list[1]? Further, may not the change from persons to gifts, which comes after the third place, be occasioned by a want of single terms to express 'workers of miracles' and 'those who exercise gifts of healing'?

We conclude then that Apostles, Prophets, and Teachers were regarded by St Paul as holding the first place of honour in the Church; but there is no evidence that they ever stood as a triad apart, as an exclusive spiritual aristocracy with authority to rule the Church. St Paul's immediate purpose in making this order of precedence was to correct a false estimate and impress upon the Corinthians the superiority of prophecy and teaching to the more attractive but less edifying gifts of healing and speaking with tongues. But though the Prophets and Teachers are placed next in honour to the Apostles, there is no ground for supposing that they had authority as rulers, even if their messages and warnings were not lightly to be set aside. The Teaching is in direct conflict with St Paul in forbidding the criticism of a Prophet's message, if once he has been recognized as a genuine Prophet: so that we cannot accept its testimony as representing a primitive conception. In this, as in many other respects, it is isolated and eccentric, and quite untrustworthy as a ground for generalization. It is safer to suppose that authority rested with the Apostles, and with such delegates as they might appoint to act on their behalf; and that only after they, the Twelve and St Paul, had passed away was it attributed in part to the shadowy Apostles

[1] Cf. Gen. xxxii 17—19, and Matt. xxii 25 ('and the first married and deceased,...in like manner the second also, and the third, unto the seventh').

of the Teaching, and in much larger part to the Prophets, whose special powers would place them above all rivals.

There is a further point which calls for criticism in the interpretation which has been given to the two passages of St Paul. Direct Divine appointment is claimed for Apostles, Prophets, and Teachers on the ground of the words 'God hath set (*or* appointed) in the church' (I Cor. xii 28), and 'he himself gave' (Eph. iv 11). But in the former passage St Paul's object is not to exalt persons as divinely selected and endowed; but to speak of all powers as alike manifestations of the One Spirit energizing in the One Body. The very phrase καὶ οὓς μὲν ἔθετο ὁ θεὸς ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ is an echo of *v.* 18, νῦν δὲ ὁ θεὸς ἔθετο τὰ μέλη, ἓν ἕκαστον αὐτῶν, ἐν τῷ σώματι καθὼς ἠθέλησεν, where ὁ θεὸς is by position emphatic. It is God who hath set the members, great and small, important and unimportant, strong and weak, all alike in the body. By giving each and all appropriate place and function 'God hath tempered the body together,' providing due balance and compensation (ἀλλὰ ὁ θεὸς συνεκέρασεν τὸ σῶμα), *v.* 24. Then in *v.* 28 we have: 'And some of those whom God hath thus set in the church are: first apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly teachers, then miracles, then gifts of healing,' &c. It is not that Apostles, Prophets, and Teachers are as individuals appointed to their respective functions by God; but rather that in God's due ordering of the Body there are persons duly qualified to fulfil these necessary functions.

In the second passage an examination of the context is equally important. The αὐτὸς ἔδωκεν of Eph. iv 11, if it stood alone, would undoubtedly emphasize the thought that the persons mentioned were direct gifts of Christ, to the exclusion of any idea of human intervention by way of selection or authorization. Even so,

the peculiar position of Apostles, Prophets, and Teachers would be shared in this matter of Divine appointment by the Pastors, who are regarded as 'officers of the local community.' But a careful exegesis disposes of the whole contention. St Paul is speaking of the grace given to each member of the body according to the measure of Christ's bestowal. The Ascended Lord, he says, is as the Psalmist said, the giver of gifts to men (ἔδωκεν δόματα). He proceeds in Rabbinic fashion to comment on the text from the Psalm: 'ascended' implies 'descended': 'he that descended, he it is that ascended' (αὐτός ἐστιν καὶ ὁ ἀναβάς). Then he proceeds in like manner to comment on ἔδωκεν δόματα: 'And he it is that gave (and these are his gifts) some apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers.' It is plain therefore that αὐτός does not here mean 'himself,' and that ἔδωκεν is a reminiscence of the quotation which he has just made, and does not emphasize the Divine appointment of particular persons to the offices of apostles, prophets, and so forth.

We may next discuss the proposition that it was the gift of teaching that gave authority to the Apostles, Prophets, and Teachers to rule the Church of God. 'Those who speak the word of God' (οἱ λαλοῦντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ) are marked off, we are told, as a superior class from ordinary members of the Church who hear and obey. Now naturally the teacher, whether Jewish Rabbi or Greek philosopher, acquired in the exercise of his function a moral authority over his scholars. But we are asked to see more than this in 'those who speak the word of God': it is as a divinely appointed class of interpreters of the will of God that they stand apart and above in exalted supremacy. This may be without difficulty granted for the original Apostles in virtue of the authority committed to them in the Gospels; and for St Paul too it will certainly

pass without challenge when we consider his own express claim and his constant practice. But for Prophets we wait for the period of the Teaching to find the claim asserted in any kind of way; and for Teachers the evidence is still wanting even there.

The expression on which so much stress is laid (οἱ λαλοῦντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ) occurs (in the singular number) in a remarkable passage of the Teaching (iv 1): 'My son, him that speaketh to thee the word of God (τοῦ λαλοῦντός σοι τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ) thou shalt remember night and day; and thou shalt honour him as the Lord: for from whence the Lordship is spoken of, there the Lord is.' The Epistle to the Hebrews offers an interesting verbal parallel (xiii 7)[1]: 'Remember your leaders, who spake unto you the word of God' (μνημονεύετε τῶν ἡγουμένων ὑμῶν, οἵτινες ἐλάλησαν ὑμῖν τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ). It has hitherto seemed obvious to interpret this as a command to hold in affectionate memory such departed leaders of the Christian community (whether local or universal) as for their ministry of the word deserve permanent gratitude. But now we are asked to see a special, almost official, meaning not only in 'leaders' (ἡγούμενοι), but also in 'the speakers of the word of God.'

It may well be doubted whether the same stress would have been laid on the expression in the Teaching, if it had been as clear from the outset as subsequent investigation has made it, that this passage is not Christian in origin at all, but that the section in which it occurs is the incorporation of a Jewish work entitled the *Two Ways*. The proof of this which was given by Dr C. Taylor is now generally accepted, and is a most

[1] The parallel between μνησθήσῃ (Did. iv 1) and μνημονεύετε (Heb. xiii 7) is of course purely verbal: for the first injunction enjoins attention to the living, the second recalls the memory of the dead. But the apparent similarity of the two precepts has probably helped to link the passages together.

important contribution to the history and interpretation of the book. As to this particular passage Dr Taylor not only points out the Hebraism contained in the order of the words 'night and day' (which has, in fact, been reversed in various ancient translations and reproductions), but he illustrates the excessive reverence demanded for the teacher from the language of Talmudic writers.

This phrase then, which has played so large a part in recent discussions, is in fact a Jewish phrase, taken over together with its strange context by the writer of the Teaching. It was not so distinctively Jewish that it could not perfectly well be retained: but it stands in no connexion with Apostles, Prophets, and Teachers, being simply one of many precepts which describe 'the way of life.' The passage in the Epistle to the Hebrews could never by itself have suggested that the term 'those who speak the word of God' was a recognized description of leaders of the Church. It must therefore drop out of the category of technical Christian phraseology: and when it is gone we shall be less inclined to accept the view that the *Lehrgabe*, or gift of teaching, was the primary ground of authority in the primitive Church.

We pass on to consider the 'charismatic' character, which has been regarded as the specific mark of the ministry of Apostles, Prophets, and Teachers. What is this new term 'charismatic' which was unknown to us thirty years ago? It has come to us from Germany, where it has been coined from the Greek 'charisma.' It is necessary at this point to take a brief survey of the use of this word in the New Testament. It occurs in the simple sense of 'gift' in Philo and once or twice as a variant in the Septuagint. The word χάρισμα is indirectly connected with χάρις, and it shares the new meaning which χάρις obtains in the language of St Paul: so that the Apostle never uses 'charisma'

without implying some special manifestation or result of Divine grace. Thus in Rom. v, as grace stands over against sin, so 'the charisma' stands over against 'the offence'; and in Rom. vi 23 the 'charisma' of God is contrasted with 'the wages of sin.' Our English Version has in several places endeavoured to emphasize the word by rendering it 'free gift': we should do it fuller justice, so far as St Paul's vocabulary is concerned, if we could be allowed the expression 'grace-gift.'

But we have here to deal with a more particular use of 'charisma,' which occurs in several passages of St Paul. In Rom. xii 6, where he is urging the individual members of the Church to a modest estimate of their own importance, the Apostle makes use of the metaphor of the Body, the several parts of which have their appropriate functions; and he continues: 'Having gifts (*χαρίσματα*) differing according to the grace (*χάριν*) that has been given to us, whether prophecy, let us prophesy according to the proportion of faith; or ministry, let us wait on our ministering; or he that teacheth, on teaching; or he that exhorteth, on exhortation; he that giveth, let him do it with simplicity; he that ruleth, with diligence; he that sheweth mercy, with cheerfulness.' Thus the grace given to the whole appears as the different 'charismata' of the various parts, according to a Divine distribution (*v.* 3). Every function of the Body, any power whatever of helping the whole, is a 'charisma,' a manifestation of that grace (*χάρις*) with which the Body is endowed. We may note in passing that the order in which the 'charismata' are here mentioned gives us no clear guidance as to precedence; and also that the Apostle passes easily from functions to persons who exercise functions.

In I Cor. i 4—7 the Apostle writes: 'I thank my God always on your behalf, for the grace (*ἐπὶ τῇ χάριτι*) of God which is given you by Jesus Christ; that in every

thing ye are enriched, in all utterance, and in all knowledge; even as the testimony of Christ was confirmed in you; so that ye come behind in no gift (*ἐν μηδενὶ χαρίσματι*).' Here we have 'the grace' and 'the grace-gift,' or special manifestation of grace, just as in the Epistle to the Romans.

In I Cor. vii 7 the Apostle declares that as regards marriage or non-marriage he would gladly have all others such as he was himself; 'but,' he adds, 'each man hath his own gift (*χάρισμα*) from God, one after this manner, and another after that.' God's grace, that is to say, manifests itself thus and thus.

We now come to the passage which most directly concerns us, I Cor. xii. We note at the outset that the section is headed 'Concerning spiritual (gifts) (*περὶ τῶν πνευματικῶν*)[1],' not 'Concerning *charismata*.' The Apostle's object is to lead his readers away from rivalry in special gifts to the recognition of the One Spirit. 'There are diversities of gifts (*χαρισμάτων*), but the same Spirit.' And again, 'To each hath been given the manifestation of the Spirit for the general profit: for to one is given by the Spirit the word of wisdom; to another the word of knowledge by the same Spirit; to another faith by the same Spirit; to another the gifts (*χαρίσματα*) of healing by the same Spirit; to another the working of miracles; to another prophecy; to another discerning of spirits; to another divers kinds of tongues; to another the interpretation of tongues.' This list doubtless includes all those special energies which had become the causes of rivalry and contention for precedence. Then, as in Rom. xii, we have the metaphor of the Body—the One Body being here spoken of in close connexion with the One Spirit. We are thus led up to the passage referred to

[1] Probably the neuter is intended, as in xiv 1, *ζηλοῦτε δὲ τὰ πνευματικά*: but it is possible to take the word as masculine, 'concerning spiritual persons': compare xiv 37, *εἴ τις δοκεῖ προφήτης εἶναι ἢ πνευματικός*.

so often above: 'God hath set in the church,' &c. at the close of which we find the injunction: 'but covet earnestly the greatest gifts (*τὰ χαρίσματα τὰ μείζονα*).'

On a review of these passages we observe that St Paul uses 'charisma' of any and every manifestation of grace (*χάρις*) in the members of the Christian Church, whether it be the great gift of prophecy or the humble gift of 'shewing mercy with cheerfulness.' There is a 'charisma' in virtue of which a man is able to refrain from marriage, and a 'charisma' by which another exercises due self-restraint in a married life. He who presides has a 'charisma' which enables him to rule with an earnest diligence; he who shares his good things with another has a 'charisma' which enables him to act liberally and with a single mind.

In face of this it seems extraordinary that the word 'charisma' should have been specialized in modern discussions of the history of the Christian ministry, so that the office of an Apostle, a Prophet, or a Teacher should be described as 'charismatic' in contrast with the office of a Bishop, a Presbyter, or a Deacon. Can we imagine that St Paul would have spoken of his apostolate as a 'charisma,' or described it as 'charismatic' (if there had been such a word as *χαρισματικός* in the Greek language)? Yet the grace (*χάρις*) which was given to him was, as he says again and again, the very ground of his Apostolic ministry. Even less conceivable is it on the other hand that he should have supposed that a Bishop, a Presbyter, or a Deacon could fulfil his function, if no 'charisma' were his to enable him.

Much mischievous confusion would be avoided if scholars would steadily refuse to specialize the word 'charisma,' and if the word 'charismatic' were altogether abandoned[1].

[1] Of the two passages in the Pastoral Epistles in which 'charisma' occurs it is hardly necessary to say more here than that the 'charisma' is an

Lastly, we have to deal with the statement that Apostles, Prophets, and Teachers belonged to the universal Church, while Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons belonged to the local community which they were appointed to serve. Here we are dealing with a distinction which for the first age requires very delicate handling. It is precisely this distinction which St Paul seems unwilling to draw. There will probably never be an agreement among his commentators as to whether he was speaking of the Church as a whole, or of the local church at Corinth, when he used the words 'God hath set in the church first apostles, secondly prophets,' and so forth. And the reason is, that he applies to the part on principle what is true of the whole. The Corinthian believers are 'the body of Christ' ('Now ye are the body of Christ, and individually members thereof'): and it is of this 'body' that he says 'God hath set the members, each one of them, in the body.' Yet he has no doubt that 'the body of Christ' is of far larger extent, and that the Corinthian community is but the local representation of that larger whole. The words 'God hath set in the church' are strictly parallel to the words 'God hath set in the body': the *ecclesia* at Corinth is the local representation of the universal *ecclesia* of all who are baptized into Christ. We can hardly doubt that the *ecclesia* at Corinth was primarily in his thoughts, but we need not therefore limit his words which are equally applicable to the *ecclesia* in its widest range.

Of Apostles it goes without saying that their ministry is not locally limited. But we cannot speak with a like assurance about Prophets. We have no reason to suppose that the Corinthians who in such

endowment for ministerial work which is mediated by the laying on of hands. The method of its reception is of interest in view of the prevailing modern use of 'charismatic' to emphasize direct endowment by God Himself without human mediation.

large numbers were ready to prophesy in the public assembly would be likely to travel with a view to exercising their prophetic powers in other places. The few instances in which we hear of prophets going from one church to another do not justify us in thinking that this was an ordinary practice. It is once more the Teaching that suggests the notion ; and we must be on our guard against reading back its representation of a degenerated institution into the fuller and less systematized life of the earliest days.

To say that the local ministry was local is a harmless remark ; but to imply that the local ministry was not a gift of God to the whole Church, and so to depreciate it in comparison with the prophets and other teachers, who sprang up within the bosom of the local community, but might be recognized for their gifts in other communities which they chose to visit—this is to go beyond anything of which the New Testament gives any hint. The implication is directly mischievous when it leads on to the conclusion that Prophets and Teachers were persons of authority, who had a right to address local communities in the name of the Church as a whole. Such a view was unknown before the discovery of the Teaching, and even from that document it can hardly be justified.

The effect of the foregoing criticisms, if they have any real force, is to break down the hard and fast distinctions that have been drawn, and to disallow a systematization which is really inapplicable to the inchoate conditions of the earliest generations of the Church's life. Apostles there were from the first, and from the first they held a supremely authoritative position ; and there were no local limits to their authority, though an Apostolic founder naturally had a unique influence in the churches of his own foundation. Prophets there were, and they might be spoken of as next in importance to Apostles ; but they were not a

sharply defined class: 'you can all prophesy one by one,' said St Paul to the Corinthians—a remark which goes far to prove that when the Apostle wrote, 'God hath set in the church first apostles, secondly prophets,' he was thinking about the function of prophecy far more than of the individuals who exercised it. This remark applies even more to the teachers whom he ranks in the third place. Those whose superior knowledge and education enabled them to give useful instruction to such as needed it could be grouped under the word 'teachers'; but it does not follow—indeed the New Testament gives little sanction to the idea—that there was a definite class who bore this as their official title. It is more natural to extend the term to include all those who in the Epistle to the Ephesians are enumerated after the apostles and prophets—namely, 'evangelists' and 'pastors and teachers.' We dispute then the theory that at any period there existed a 'triad' of Apostles, Prophets, and Teachers, with a personal preeminence and a recognized claim to honour. Such a preeminence remains undisputed for the Apostles—that is, for the Apostles *par excellence*, of whom alone St Paul was probably thinking: but prophecy and teaching were valuable functions, which the Apostle sought to exalt above healing and speaking with tongues, but which did not necessarily give to those who exercised them any definite status or any authoritative position. The prophets of the Teaching are not home products like those of the Corinthian church: they, indeed, are professional: what St Paul feared has come true, and the function has produced an abnormal exaltation of the person.

We have further shewn that the view that Apostles, Prophets, and Teachers represent a 'charismatic' ministry involves a misuse of the term 'charisma,' which in St Paul's language stands for any gift of grace which enables any member of the Church to fulfil his

appropriate function, however exalted or however humble that function may be. The Apostle would have been startled by the suggestion that bishops and deacons could execute their office aright without the Divine aid of the corresponding 'charisma.' If what is meant is merely that prophets were not appointed by any human instrumentality, whereas bishops and deacons were, that has always been recognized; and we have only to protest against the new term which has been invented to emphasize the distinction.

2. *Lightfoot's exposition of the origin of the Threefold Ministry.*

It will be useful here to give a brief sketch of the historical account of the early ministry of the Church, which Lightfoot appended to his *Commentary on Philippians* in the year 1868; and to ask what modifications appear to be required by subsequent investigations or discoveries. After citing the two Pauline summaries of the functions exercised by various members of the Church, he says: 'Neither list can have been intended to be exhaustive. In both alike the work of converting unbelievers and founding congregations holds the foremost place, while the permanent government and instruction of the several churches is kept in the background...But the permanent ministry, though lightly touched upon, is not forgotten; for under the designation of "teachers, helps, governments" in the one passage, of "pastors and teachers" in the other, these officers must be intended...From the subordinate place, which it thus occupies in the notices of St Paul, the permanent ministry gradually emerged, as the Church assumed a more settled form, and the higher but temporary offices, such as the apostolate, fell away.'

It may be doubted whether anything can be wisely added to this statement. The modern attempt to erect

the Prophets into officers of an undefined authority, second only to that of the Apostles, is really without foundation. Suggested by the statements of the Teaching, it rests so far as the New Testament is concerned mainly upon the occasional mention of prophets, such as Agabus who foretold the famine at Jerusalem and the imprisonment of St Paul, the notice of prophets at Antioch, and the description of the numerous persons who exercised some kind of prophetic gift in the church of Corinth and whom the Apostle endeavoured at once to honour and to restrain within orderly bounds. Corinth was, however, in all probability quite exceptional; and prophecy there, so far from being a form of regulating ministry, was actually a source of disorder and confusion. The references to prophets in the Apocalypse of St John seem to me to stand somewhat apart. The book itself claims to be a prophecy, and the seer models himself on the prophets of the Old Testament. This is perhaps mainly a matter of literary form[1]. The prophets spoken of (e.g. 'thy brethren the prophets') are not clearly defined figures: certainly we have no warrant for reckoning them as church rulers. We shall probably be right in assuming that in most churches the prophet was an entirely exceptional figure, though there might be men or women who occasionally spoke by a special inspiration or were the recipients of visions. There is nothing to bind these various persons together as a definite class responsible in any way for the leadership or administration of the Church[2]. Of

[1] Compare especially Ezek. ii 8—iii 3 (the eating of a book in connexion with a commission to prophesy), with Apoc. x 8—11, where the ancient conception is reproduced with conscious modifications.

[2] I must guard myself against seeming in this paragraph to underestimate the importance of prophecy as a manifestation of the Spirit characteristic of the New Dispensation. I am only concerned with the view that there was an 'order' of Prophets in the particular sense of inspired rulers of the Christian societies, who were clothed with an authority only short of apostolic.

Teachers, Lightfoot says but little: and so far from ranking them with Apostles and Prophets as a temporary institution, he regards the phrase 'pastors and teachers' as a vague indication of a permanent local ministry.

Lightfoot then turns to St Luke, whose authority, so much discredited in recent years, has begun to regain its old place of honour. 'St Luke's narrative represents the Twelve Apostles in the earliest days as the sole directors and administrators of the Church. For the financial business of the infant community, not less than for its spiritual guidance, they alone are responsible. This state of things could not last long. By the rapid accession of numbers, and still more by the admission of heterogeneous classes into the Church, the work became too vast and too various for them to discharge unaided. To relieve them from the increasing pressure, the inferior and less important functions passed successively into other hands: and thus each grade of the ministry, beginning from the lowest, was created in order.'

This is a very interesting statement. It is a recognition that according to the primitive conception all authority was lodged in the apostolate, and that as soon as its practical exercise demanded assistance the less important duties were delegated by the Apostles themselves as circumstances suggested. 'The establishment of the diaconate came first.' Lightfoot prefers to accept the unanimous tradition, which reaches back to Irenaeus, that the office to which the Seven were appointed corresponds with the later diaconate. This view has been disputed, mainly on the ground that the Seven were men of a much higher calibre than the deacons, who are described, for example, in the Pastoral Epistles as little more than the servants of the bishop. So far as it is a question of titles, it may well be that the Seven were never styled 'deacons.' But, though they were doubtless persons of considerable prominence and highly

gifted, and though they did not confine themselves to the performance of humble offices, yet it remains true that they were appointed to help the Apostles by relieving them of the lowest duties of ministerial service. 'The functions are substantially those which devolved on the deacons of the earliest ages, and which still in theory, though not altogether in practice, form the primary duties of the office. Again, it seems clear from the emphasis with which St Luke dwells on the new institution, that he looks on the establishment of this office, not as an isolated incident, but as the initiation of a new order of things in the Church. It is in short one of those representative facts, of which the earlier part of his narrative is almost wholly made up.' What is of chief importance in St Luke's account is the distinctness with which he indicates that the first step towards the creation of a ministry assistant to the apostolate is taken by direction of the Twelve, and that, while they permit the community to select the persons to be appointed, the appointment is made by the imposition of the hands of the Twelve.

From deacons we pass on to presbyters. 'While the diaconate was thus an entirely new creation, called forth by a special emergency and developed by the progress of events, the early history of the presbyterate was different. If the sacred historian dwells at length on the institution of the lower office but is silent about the first beginnings of the higher, the explanation seems to be, that the latter had not the claim of novelty like the former.' As the Church naturally organized itself on the model of the synagogue, 'a body of elders or presbyters would be chosen to direct the religious worship and partly also to watch over the temporal well-being of the society.' St Luke appears to treat the institution as a matter of course, and first mentions it incidentally about the time of the death of St James and the dispersion of the Twelve from Jerusalem on a wider

mission: 'from this time forward all official communications with the mother Church are carried on through their intervention.' The extension of the institution is sufficiently noted by the fact that 'on their very first missionary journey the Apostles Paul and Barnabas are described as appointing presbyters in every church.'

This origin of the presbyterate is now very commonly admitted. We pass on to consider the duties of the presbyters. 'They were both rulers and instructors of the congregation. This double function appears in St Paul's expression "pastors and teachers," where, as the form of the original seems to shew, the two words describe the same office under different aspects. Though *government* was probably the first conception of the office, yet the work of *teaching* must have fallen to the presbyters from the very first and have assumed greater prominence as time went on.'

At this point arises the much discussed question of the relation of the term 'presbyter' to the term 'bishop.' 'In the apostolic writings,' says Lightfoot, 'the two are only different designations of one and the same office.' The presbyter is called bishop, however, only in the Gentile Churches. 'Thus the word [ἐπίσκοπος] would seem to be especially Hellenic. Beyond this we are left to conjecture. But if we may assume that the directors of religious and social clubs among the heathen were commonly so called[1], it would naturally occur, if not to the Gentile Christians themselves, at all events to their heathen associates, as a fit designation for the presiding members of the new Society. The infant Church of Christ, which appeared to the Jew as a synagogue, would be regarded by the heathen as a confraternity. But whatever may have been the origin of the term, it did not altogether dispossess the earlier

[1] Lightfoot adds in a footnote: 'The evidence however is slight and unsatisfactory.'

name "presbyter," which still held its place as a synonyme even in Gentile congregations. And, when at length the term bishop was appropriated to a higher office in the Church, the latter became again, as it had been at first, the sole designation of the Christian elder.'

It is interesting here to note how in a few well-chosen words Lightfoot had summed up beforehand all that criticism has now left of Dr Hatch's theory of the influence of heathen confraternities on the earliest organization of the Church. As to the more important question of the interchangeability of the terms 'presbyter' and 'bishop,' subsequent discussion has led to the recognition of a distinction, to the effect that, while all bishops were presbyters, not all presbyters were termed bishops: the presbyters being regarded as the governing college, and the bishops those members of that college who were also its executive officers. Perhaps however this statement of the distinction, convenient as it is, is too precisely drawn. It may be wiser to say that the term 'presbyter' connotes a function shared with others, a joint responsibility[1]: whereas the term 'bishop' suggests a personal action and responsibility, the outlook of one man upon the conduct or work of others, a direct initiative rather than a share in consultative government. Hence '*the* bishop' is spoken of in the Pastoral Epistles, not because there was necessarily but one, but because the function of the bishop *qua* bishop has a certain independence, which is lacking for example to the deacons, who are at once spoken of in the plural and are clearly the servants of the bishop. It is just this difference in connotation which ultimately led to the appropriation of the term 'bishop' to the highest office of the fully developed ministry.

[1] So that the body of presbyters, among the Christians as well as among the Jews, is called 'the presbytery.'

We have next to consider what traces or foreshadowings the New Testament offers us of the third and highest order of ministry, the episcopate properly so called. After pointing out that Theodoret was mistaken in his view that the office of the original Apostles was continued in the office of bishops, Lightfoot maintains that 'the episcopate was formed not out of the apostolic order by localisation but out of the presbyteral by elevation.' He finds not indeed the name but the type of the true episcopate in the commanding position held by James the Lord's brother in the mother church of Jerusalem: the way in which he is mentioned in connexion with the presbyters suggests that 'he was in fact the head or president of the college.'

But while this is admittedly true for the church of Jerusalem, the example does not appear to have been followed in the Gentile congregations. In these we trace two stages of developement: first, occasional supervision by the Apostles themselves; and secondly, residence of apostolic delegates. The position of Timothy in Ephesus and of Titus in Crete was indeed only temporary, and they were not termed bishops: yet 'they were in fact the link between the Apostle whose superintendence was occasional and general and the bishop who exercised a permanent supervision over an individual congregation.' The New Testament writings carry us no further than this: 'yet unless we have recourse to a sweeping condemnation of received documents, it seems vain to deny that early in the second century the episcopal office was firmly and widely established.'

How then did this change come about? After examining a theory propounded by Rothe in answer to this question, and noting the early tradition which connects the name of St John with the appointment of bishops in Asia Minor, Lightfoot offers his own answer in the following words:

'We have seen that the needs of the Church and the ascendancy of his personal character placed St James at the head of the Christian brotherhood in Jerusalem. Though remaining a member of the presbyteral council, he was singled out from the rest, and placed in a position of superior responsibility. His exact power it would be impossible, and it is unnecessary, to define. When therefore after the fall of the city St John with other surviving Apostles removed to Asia Minor and found there manifold irregularities and threatening symptoms of disruption, he would not unnaturally encourage an approach in these Gentile Churches to the same organization, which had been signally blessed, and proved effectual in holding together the mother Church amid dangers not less serious. The existence of a council or college necessarily supposes a presidency of some kind, whether this presidency be assumed by each member in turn, or lodged in the hands of a single person. It was only necessary therefore for him to give permanence, definiteness, stability, to an office which already existed in germ. There is no reason however for supposing that any direct ordinance was issued to the churches. The evident utility and even pressing need of such an office, sanctioned by the most venerated name in Christendom, would be sufficient to secure its wide though gradual reception. Such a reception, it is true, supposes a substantial harmony and freedom of intercourse among the churches, which remained undisturbed by the troubles of the times; but the silence of history is not at all unfavourable to this supposition. In this way, during the historical blank which extends over half a century after the fall of Jerusalem, episcopacy was matured and the Catholic Church consolidated[1].'

[1] To the notices of the earliest traces of episcopacy in the various churches which Lightfoot has collected and discussed, it does not appear that recent research has anything of moment to add. The peculiar position of the

If there is anything substantial to be added to the general explanation thus given, it is from two considerations on which more stress has come to be laid. First, the intercourse between one church and another would tend to throw responsibility upon a single prominent individual representing the interests of the community and speaking or writing in its name; and the same person would naturally receive travelling brethren from other churches and provide them with the necessary hospitality, and this again would presuppose that the funds of the church were largely at his disposal. But, secondly, a yet more important factor in developing a single office of supreme eminence is to be found in the growth of the Eucharist as the principal liturgical service of the Church. The dimness of the period during which episcopacy was being developed hides from us equally the process by which the common meal described in the First Epistle to the Corinthians became the regulated Sunday service of which Justin Martyr gives us so clear an account: but we may be sure that the two developements were not unconnected, and we shall probably be right in laying more stress upon presidency at the Eucharist than on presidency at any council which may be assumed to have existed for the general management of local church affairs.

I do not know that history has more to tell us than Lightfoot has presented in a summary form with his characteristic accuracy, perspicuity, and vigour. The facts may be looked at from various points of view, but no important addition to them is at present forthcoming. The glamour of the Teaching of the Twelve

presbyters at Alexandria receives full recognition at his hands, though he was not aware of the curious *dictum* of Abbot Poemen to which attention was drawn a few years ago by Dom Cuthbert Butler (now Abbot Butler) in his *Palladius* (*Texts and Studies* vol. VI no. 1 p. 213). The remainder of Lightfoot's essay deals with the growth of the episcopal power after the period of its first establishment, and does not concern us here.

Apostles has beguiled us for a time into imagining that what may be called a ministry of enthusiasm stood in the earliest period over against the ministry of office which eventually superseded it. But when a more careful study of the 'prophet' of the New Testament has set aside the notion that Apostles, Prophets, and Teachers formed a triad of ruling officers in the early Church, we shall not any longer be disposed to question Lightfoot's view that authority rested with the Twelve and St Paul on the ground of a commission held directly from our Lord; that at Jerusalem the position of St James practically anticipated the form of the later episcopate and was not without influence in promoting its universal extension; and that in some of the Gentile churches apostolic delegates demonstrated the advantages of the rule of one superior officer, while for Asia Minor the tradition may be accepted which connects the appointment of bishops with the Apostle St John.

3. *Summary and Conclusion.*

We have seen that the most serious result of the addition of the Teaching to the authorities which thirty years ago were available for the reconstruction of the early history of the Church is that there has grown up a generally accepted belief that towards the end of the first century there were two forms of ministry existing side by side, one of which was beginning to disappear and to yield the place of honour to its later rival. The former is termed by some writers the 'charismatic' ministry—by an unwarranted limitation of the word 'charisma'; and by other writers the 'prophetic' ministry—by an equally unjustifiable extension of the word 'prophet': but, whether misnamed or not, such a ministry is assumed to have existed, and to have a better right to

be considered primitive than what is sometimes called the 'official' ministry.

The most notable distinction that is drawn between the two ministries is that the former consisted of persons whose spiritual gifts marked them out as divinely called to serve the Church, whether as Apostles, as Prophets, or as Teachers. It is usually held that while these ministers were not chosen by the Church, yet the Church gave them recognition: that is to say, that the local community as a free, independent, and self-governing body had the right and the duty of testing those who claimed to exercise their gifts in its midst, and of formally recognizing or refusing to recognize that they were genuinely called of God. Apparently this right and responsibility is a deduction from the statements made in the Teaching with regard to persons coming from outside and presenting themselves as Apostles or Prophets or Teachers. It is important to note that such precautions as are there urged concern itinerant persons, who visit a community in passing or who come with a desire to find a new home. It is quite evident that what is said is intended simply as a safeguard against impostors; and it is in harmony with this that the one test suggested is whether or not they appear to be greedy of rewards. But this is in reality no kind of proof that the early Christian communities were responsible for deciding whether divinely-gifted men were to be recognized as ministers of the Church. The New Testament offers no hint of this, unless it be in the case of one of the Seven Churches of the Apocalypse which had rightly rejected the claim of certain persons to be Apostles. Indeed the idea of free, independent, and self-governing communities formally exercising discipline of any kind is a modern guess, which appears to base itself on the single instance of the Church at Corinth, where a solemn assembly

seems to have been held to carry into effect a command of St Paul, as though he himself were present.

There is no reason to think that Prophets and Teachers had any disciplinary powers whatever. They had a 'ministry' (just as healers, and speakers with tongues, and other gifted individuals had), which was to be used for the edification of the Church and not for their own self-exaltation. But there is no sign that the exercise of their ministry was other than spontaneous, or that it either needed or received any formal recognition from those amongst whom it was exercised: nor is there any sign that it gave them any kind of authority in the community, except such as an influential person must necessarily have enjoyed.

We have considered in detail the conception of the earliest stages of the growth of the Christian Ministry which Lightfoot put forward in his famous Essay. It has been said of him in another connexion that 'he chose his ground so well' that it was not easy to dislodge him. That is eminently true in the present instance. Subsequent research or discovery has left his position as strong as ever. He would not have claimed more than to have given a reasonable interpretation of the available facts. New theories have since been offered to us: we can hardly say that new facts have come to light which require that his interpretation should be modified.

What is the bearing of the results of our enquiry upon those questions in regard to the Christian Ministry which chiefly interest us today? During more than a generation the origins of that Ministry have been investigated from every point of view. The documents of the apostolic and sub-apostolic periods have been subjected to the acutest criticism. Every nook and cranny of the history has been diligently explored. No strange or startling revelations have been made. New theories have come and gone: they are coming and

going still. But at most they serve to call attention to facts or groups of facts which have been long known, if insufficiently heeded.

We see perhaps more clearly than we saw before that the Christian Ministry was gradually evolved, in response to fresh needs which came with new conditions, as the Church grew in numbers and enlarged its geographical boundaries. We find that a Threefold Ministry emerges, which has proved itself capable of satisfying the wants of the Christian Church from the second century to the present day. Not that the functions of ministry have always been distributed in exactly the same proportion between bishops, priests, and deacons: each office has had an evolution of its own, and at the present moment the diaconate has, at least in the Western Church, fallen strangely into the background. But the whole framework remains, with its powers of adaptation by no means exhausted, the permanent gift of the Divine Spirit to the Church.

We cannot go back, if we would, to the immaturity of primitive days. We need now, as much as the sub-apostolic age needed, a ministry which can hold the whole Church together. We cannot accept a congregational independence, which subordinates the minister, and which aims at offering examples of the corporate life on a limited scale without reference to the larger corporate life of the One Body of the Christ. Such examples indeed are of value as representing the truth that each group or community of Christians is *pro tanto* representative of the One Body; and indeed the corporate life is more easily exemplified on the smaller scale. Analogies might be found in the separate churches of Corinth and Ephesus, if it were possible to forget St Paul. But we cannot be content with any system of local independence, on however large a scale, which tries to live, so to speak, in the apostolic age without the unifying control of the Apostles.

It is for the unity of the whole that the Historic Threefold Ministry stands. It grew out of the need for preservation of unity when the Apostles themselves were withdrawn. It is, humanly speaking, inconceivable that unity can be re-established on any other basis. This is not to say that a particular doctrine of Apostolic Succession must needs be held by all Christians alike. But the principle of transmission of ministerial authority makes for unity, while the view that ministry originates afresh at the behest of a particular church or congregation makes for division and subdivision.

We have the happiness to live in days in which a reaction has set in against the long process of the division and subdivision of Christendom. Earnest spirits everywhere around us are yearning after unity. On a reasonable interrogation of history the principle can be seen to emerge that ministry was the result of commission from those who had themselves received authority to transmit it. In other words we are compelled to the recognition that, at least for the purposes of unity, the episcopate is the successor of the apostolate.

ESSAY III

APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION

A. THE ORIGINAL CONCEPTION

B. THE PROBLEM OF NON-CATHOLIC ORDERS

C. H. TURNER, M.A.

SUMMARY

A. APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION: THE ORIGINAL CONCEPTION

I. Meaning of 'Apostolic Succession' not always the same. Situation out of which the original emphasis on it grew up: the danger to the Church from the Gnostic movement, and the appeal against it to the Apostolic tradition in the threefold form of the Creed, the Scriptures, and the Successions. For a bishop to be in this sense in the succession from the Apostles a double qualification requisite: in technical language, he must have both orders and jurisdiction. pp. 95–108

II. The conception traced in further detail during the first two hundred years after the Apostles. Clement of Rome: Ignatius: special prominence in Hegesippus and Irenaeus: Tertullian and Origen: possible traces of developement in Hippolytus and Cyprian. pp. 108–132

III. Eusebius' large use of 'succession' language, as a guarantee of historical continuity: the 'succession from the Apostles' of the bishops of the great sees, Rome, Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem, in the forefront both of the *History* and of the *Chronicle*. Were the Apostle-founders reckoned during early times in the episcopal lists? pp. 132–142

B. THE PROBLEM OF NON-CATHOLIC ORDERS

I. Can the Apostolic Succession exist outside the Church? The primitive view implicitly rejected all non-catholic Sacraments: but the problem of the relation of the Sacraments to the Church became crucial in the third century—first as to baptism, and especially the baptism of schismatics. In the clearing up of ideas three views emerged: St Cyprian rejects all baptism outside the Church; Rome admits any baptism given with right form and matter; the Easterns admit in some cases, reject in others, but with a tendency to extend the area of admissions. So far no non-catholic Sacrament ratified except Baptism. pp. 143–161

II. In particular Orders conferred outside the Church universally rejected, partly (*a*) because none who had been put to public penance could either receive or exercise Holy Orders, partly (*b*) on the ground that the Holy Spirit could not be given, either in Confirmation or Ordination, save within the Church. With the growth of divisions in the fourth century came the desire to stretch every available point in the interest of peace (1) where there was no formally organized schism, by giving the separated clergy, when reconciled, authority to minister; (2) where there was organized separation, by reordaining the clergy on reconciliation. pp. 161–179

III. A third and more drastic solution was first put into coherent shape by St Augustine, namely that all Sacraments duly administered outside the Church were valid, although the real benefit of them only accrued on union with the Church. And this was the view which finally prevailed throughout the West. Nevertheless to Augustine the idea of the Succession was still confined within the Church. pp. 179–194

IV. Conclusion. pp. 194–196

NOTES

Use of succession-language in non-Christian sources: p. 197. Use of succession-language in early Christian writers: p. 199. Chronology of the life of Hegesippus: p. 207. Meaning of *χειροθετουμένους* in canon 8 of Nicaea: p. 208. The Letters of Severus of Antioch: p. 211.

III

APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION

A. THE ORIGINAL CONCEPTION

I

The special contribution which the Christian writers of the second century made to the doctrine of the Ministry concentrated itself in the stress which they laid on the formal connexion between the Episcopate of their own day and the Apostles of the first age of the Church. This 'Apostolic Succession,' to give their teaching its technical phraseology, is as prominent a theme in the argument of Hegesippus or Irenaeus as it is in the argument of the English Tractarians. It is the business of the present enquiry to examine the origin and purpose of this emphasis on Apostolic Succession, to fix its exact meaning in the minds of those who first phrased it, and to trace the modification which the idea underwent during the patristic period—that is, in particular, between St Irenaeus and St Augustine. When people talk nowadays of Apostolic Succession, it may almost be taken for granted that they mean (whether they are aware of it or not) the doctrine of the Succession in the form in which it is deduced from the great conception of the Christian Ministry and the Christian Sacraments, their 'validity' and their 'regularity,' which was first worked out in St Augustine's contributions to the Donatist controversy. But behind the coherent and systematic theory which we may for convenience call 'Augustinian,' the doctrine of the Succession had had a history

of two centuries and more : and the developement of ideas which during the third and fourth centuries altered the attitude of Western theologians towards the mutual relations of the Church and the Sacraments could not fail to bring with it in the end some corresponding change in the meaning attached to Apostolic Succession as a necessary qualification of the Christian Ministry. Our primary concern here is with the doctrine not in its ultimate but in its earliest stage, as it was first formulated and asserted in the course of the controversy with Gnosticism.

Emphasis on the Apostolic Succession emerges in history at the same crisis and under pressure of the same danger as emphasis on the Apostolic Scriptures and on the Apostolic Creed. These made the three-fold cord which secured the hold of second-century Christians upon their apostolic origin ; if their right to it was established, they and they alone were the authorized representatives of the Gospel of Jesus Christ in the world, and the Body of which they were members was the only adequate vehicle of His teaching and expression of His Spirit. But the putting into words of this exclusive claim was, as it were, forced upon Christians of the 'great Church' from without : for the critical note of the situation, as it began to present itself about the year 150, was that the Gnostic movement was borrowing more and more Christian elements, creating a more complete organization of systems or societies on lines that emulated the Catholic Society, claiming more insistently to be the real heir to the future of the Christian religion.

This was a novel feature, though Gnosticism was then nothing new. Like Christianity itself, it was one of many movements which went to make up the drama of the religious developement of the Roman Imperial Age. While the West was extending its material empire over the East, the East was permeating at

a thousand points the life and thought and worship of the West ; and in this warfare of religious influences it was no longer in the main Greece but Asia (and Egypt which is part of Asia) that was the giver, and Europe the receiver. The devotees of the Great Mother from Phrygia and of the Bona Dea from Syria, Isis worship from Egypt and (somewhat later) Mithras worship from Persia, jostled in their hurry to the West the followers of Moses and of Christ. Gnosticism is but a general name for such forms of this movement from the East as entered from the outset into combination with Jewish and Christian elements.

In the first forms of Gnosticism, those for instance which meet us in the New Testament books, the Christian elements were relatively small—so small that no question could arise of any claim on its part to be representative of Christianity. Nor would it have been possible, so long as any number of the original apostles and disciples still survived, to oust them from their place as the unquestioned guardians of the Christian tradition. Even as late as St Ignatius, that is to say some years after the beginning of the second century, Docetism, though a real danger, was not a danger in the sense of presenting an actual counterfeit of Catholic religion. Conversely, in the developed maturity of Christianity, the various expressions of divergent thought which crystallized into heresy had of course grown up within the Church and had inherited the common stock of tradition and looked upon themselves as its true representatives. The great Gnostic teachers of the middle of the second century could not claim, as Arians or Nestorians or Monophysites did claim, to be the guardians of the one public and authorized and traditional form of the Christian faith, seeing that Gnosticism, however strong the Christian colouring which it took on at the hands of its final exponents, was for all that, in its history and origin,

an independent movement. But Basilides and Valentinus and Marcion did at least assert, unlike their own predecessors, a real historical connexion between themselves and the original disciples of Christ. It was obvious that the known facts of the history of Christianity gave no support to the contention. But against these known facts they alleged a secret tradition of higher and more advanced teaching imparted by the Apostles to such of their converts as were capable of receiving it. The stream had trickled down by subterranean channels, and only in a later generation, so they taught, was emerging to the light of day. It was in the second quarter of the second century that the larger systematizations of Gnosticism commenced this rivalry with the Catholic Church : in the third quarter the movement was at the zenith of its influence.

Yet however aptly in its ultimate manifestations Gnosticism simulated the external semblance of the Church, and however real its approach to the Christian level of life, it was still separated as a whole from the Christianity of the apostles by a deep and impassable gulf. Whatever the ethical difference between the lofty austerity of Marcion and the lower forms of Gnostic teaching, he and they were bound together by their common fundamental tenet of the evil of matter. Everywhere and always, in opposition to the Church, the Gnostic taught that the taint of evil in the material world around us is not merely accidental but essential ; and therefore if the Supreme God is good, he cannot also be the Creator. The human body can be no exception to the rule that what is formed out of matter is evil in itself ; and the Son of God, if he is found in fashion as a man, can be so only in appearance, not in reality. There can be no true Incarnation, just as there can be no true redemption or resurrection of the body. The teaching of the Old Testament

Scriptures about Creation, and the teaching of the New Testament Scriptures about Incarnation and Resurrection, are equally inadmissible.

Nevertheless, though Gnostic theology thus contradicted the fundamental bases of both the Jewish and the Christian tradition, the second century of our era felt so passionate a need for an answer to its moral and intellectual yearnings after God, and Gnosticism possessed so much vitality and so much attractiveness in its Christianized forms, that it was able to make a serious bid for the religious leadership of the Roman world. Catholic Christianity has in fact never passed, humanly speaking, through any other crisis of such utter peril—the forces arrayed against it were to all seeming so strong, the forces upon which it could count in comparison so slender.

For the net result of the first hundred years of Christian history might have looked none too reassuring. The battle fought for Gentile liberty had indeed resulted in early emancipation from Judaism, and the Christian community had become thereby a potential Church Universal. But on the other hand the victory had made irreconcilable enemies of the Jews, and it had involved the sacrifice of all the prestige and organization and privileges which attached to the Jewish Church. The idea of a Catholic Church was no less repugnant to the existing Roman State than to contemporary Jewish theology: so soon as it was clear that Christianity was something different from and larger than Judaism, Christians forfeited the legal protection which had belonged to them as Jews. Under Nero and the Flavian emperors it became a settled principle of imperial policy that Christianity was in itself illegal. No doubt the Church was as yet too insignificant in numbers for any systematic campaign to be undertaken against it, while the humane reaction under Nerva and his immediate

successors tended to throw the influence of the central government on the side of checking rather than of accentuating the strict application of the law. But it continued to be true that 'non licet esse christianos'; a mob might any day get out of hand or a magistrate press his powers, and no Christian could tell whether it might not be his turn next to confess the Name. Suffering and martyrdom are the background as well of the letters of Ignatius and the *Shepherd* of Hermas in the second century as of the Apocalypse and the letter of the Roman Clement at the end of the first. When Antoninus Pius succeeded Hadrian, and M. Aurelius followed Pius, the outlook was blacker still. The well earned repute of these two sovereigns for justice and rectitude encouraged the Christians to submit to them one appeal after another. In the two middle quarters of the second century the extant Christian literature is for the most part 'apologetic'; and these first Apologies are not, like the treatise for instance of Origen against Celsus, a sustained argument for the truth of Christianity, they are primarily pleas for toleration, addressed to the emperor and not to the enquirer—urgent entreaties, on behalf of the small and scattered groups of adherents of the new religion, for protection at the hands of the imperial government.

It was the community thus disowned and detested by Judaism, subjected to such tremendous pressure of social and legal disabilities, which was called upon to face the long struggle with Gnosticism; and the struggle came to its worst at a time when the Church was but poorly represented on the intellectual *terrain*. The first chapter of creative theology had closed with the Fourth Evangelist and St Ignatius: the greater Gnostics and their immediate disciples found in Papias and Hermas and Polycarp and Hegesippus, even in Justin, no opponents of the same mettle with themselves. Not till Irenaeus and Clement of Alexandria does the

balance begin to be redressed: not till Tertullian and Origen is the intellectual supremacy of the Church assured. The brunt fell, as in the earliest days, on a generation among whom there were 'not many wise': and Christian theology owes an unforgettable debt to the men who, amid all the discouragements of an unequal situation, clung fast to the 'foolishness of the' apostolic 'preaching.'

What then had the Catholic defence in the last resort to fall back upon?

There was something about the Christian tradition which attracted the Gnostics and which they felt to be of supreme value. The Catholic asserted that this tradition belonged to the Church, and to the Church only; and if it was retorted that that was just the question at issue, he would point out that at least the Society to which he belonged had been, as a matter of history, the channel which had conveyed the tradition from its source in the apostles down to his own day. In the process of clearing up ideas and of testing the presumptions to be drawn from admitted facts, the Church came to rely, for the establishment of her title to the exclusive possession of the genuine Christian tradition, on a threefold line of appeal—to the Apostolic Creed, the Apostolic Scriptures, and the Apostolic Successions.

1. When Christians spoke of the 'Rule of Faith' as 'Apostolic,' they did not mean that the apostles had met and formulated it, still less that it could be divided up into twelve sections, each the work of an individual apostle: these were later and legendary interpretations of the phrase 'Apostles'' Creed. What they meant was that the profession of belief which every catechumen recited before his baptism did embody in summary form the faith which the apostles had taught and had committed to their disciples to teach after them. In its main traits this profession was the

same everywhere ; everywhere its outline corresponded to the baptismal formula, and consisted therefore of three sections, confession of belief in the Father, and in the Son, and in the Holy Spirit ; everywhere also the middle section was expanded into a statement of the chief facts concerning the historical manifestation of the Son of God among men, such as that of which a fragment is cited by St Paul in 1 Cor. xv. as part of his original and central teaching to his Corinthian converts. But though thus universal in usage, and constant as to its main scheme so far back that 'the memory of man runneth not to the contrary,' it was not stereotyped in its detail, and did in fact grow by the addition from time to time of new subordinate clauses. The exact form in which we ourselves know and use the Apostles' Creed goes back some 1200 years ; but the verifiable history of the Creed can be traced further still for half as long again, and scholars have been able to reconstruct in almost verbal exactitude the Creed which the Roman Church professed about the middle of the second century. This Old Roman Creed, the kernel of our present Western Creed, would have been confidently believed by Roman Christians of that day, such as Justin Martyr, to express against the Gnostics the veritable substance of the Apostolic preaching. In proclaiming that Christ Jesus the Son of God had been born and crucified and buried and had risen on the third day—all this not in any mere deceptive appearance, but (as Ignatius had put it a generation earlier) with a real Birth and a real Crucifixion and a real Resurrection—in confessing further their belief in the holy Church and the resurrection of the body, they were well assured that they continued steadfast in the Apostles' doctrine, *προσκαρτεροῦντες τῇ διδαχῇ τῶν ἀποστόλων.*

2. But the Apostolic Creed did not stand alone. There was a ready test in the Apostolic writings of the

truth of the Catholic claim to the inheritance of apostolic doctrine. These Scriptures of the New Covenant had come, gradually and as it were reluctantly, to be recognized as of equal validity with the Scriptures of the Old Covenant; by about the middle of the second century the conviction was assured that the Church possessed such a *corpus* of authoritative Christian documents, and there was also universal agreement about its principal component parts. The Four Gospels and the Epistles of St Paul—apart, perhaps, from his letters to individuals, Timothy, Titus, Philemon—were the indestructible nucleus. No other Epistles but those of St Paul had so far this catholic acceptance: the extent to which 'the Apostle,' ὁ ἀπόστολος, dominated through the New Testament Canon the Church of the second century has not been adequately realized. Under pressure of the Gnostic controversy Catholic theology began to hammer out a principle of admission and exclusion: the Scriptures of what was later called the New Testament were the 'Apostolic' Scriptures. Of the writings on the fringe of the Canon—those which in this or that quarter had attained or were on their way to attain a partial acceptance—some, as this criterion of 'apostolicity' came to be more rigidly applied, were rejected on the ground that they made no real claim to apostolic origin (among these would be the *Shepherd* of Hermas), others, like various pseudonymous Gospels and Acts, on the ground that the claim they made was false, and shewn to be false by the lack of public and open testimony; while some again, like the Epistle of St Peter, satisfied every test and were placed, in theory at least, on a level with the Pauline collection. The canonical Gospels had been rooted in the allegiance of the faithful before theories about the Canon began to be ventilated: they were part of the material which had anyhow to be included, but the Church writers found no difficulty in sheltering the second Gospel

under the aegis of the apostle Peter, and the third Gospel under the aegis of the apostle Paul. The Gospels, as well as the Epistles, were 'apostolic.'

3. If the apostolic idea had been limited to a body of documents, which with every generation grew more ancient, and to a creed, which in substance was to be as unchanging as the documents, it might have been possible to say that the idea thus limited belonged to and was bound up with the dead past, and that any theology, to be vital, must find room for the complementary truth that the religion of Christ, as expressed in the society of disciples informed by His Spirit, is a living organism. The 'apostolic' principle, if it was to justify itself as covering the whole ground, must somehow be kept in touch with the pulse of the Church as it beat more and more fully in each successive generation. And part of the effectiveness of the Gnostic propaganda lay perhaps exactly in its appeal to this sense of expansion and developement; the seed of the Gospel grew and ripened into a wondrous fruit: just as, conversely, recourse to the 'apostolic' past, whether to its Creed or to its Scriptures, has become clogged and barren, whenever the needs of the living Church in each present day are not brought into vital relation with it. To Catholic Christians of the second century, though their appeal to the apostolic test was no doubt in the main a conservative one—they meant by it that the Gnostic theology was no true developement from the teaching of Christ and His apostles, no true progress hall-marked by the Spirit—it would never have occurred that it was possible even in thought to divorce the present from the past, the ancient apostolic Church from the living catholic Church. The Faith was not to be looked for in books or in formulas, but in the fellowship to which the books were committed, and of which the formulas constituted the test of membership. And the technical expression of this belief was the

emphasis, side by side with the appeal to the Apostolic Creed and the Apostolic Scriptures, on the appeal to the Apostolic Successions. Here lay the guarantee of permanence both for the truth of the faith witnessed to from age to age and for the life sacramentally communicated by the diverse ministries of the Spirit in the Body of Christ.

But Gnostics too claimed, as we have seen, a historical connexion with the apostles ; a succession, that is, of disciples through whom the true Gnostic doctrine was secretly handed on from one generation to the next, as a mystery not to be announced to the world until this or that Gnostic teacher published it in the shape of some elaborated scheme of redemption. The first characteristic then of the Catholic appeal to the Succession is that it admits of verification by every man, because the Succession to which appeal is made has been part and parcel all along of the history of the community. The bishop of any Christian church is the head and representative of his flock, and has been regularly and openly put into possession of the *cathedra* or teaching chair, in succession to a predecessor who had in turn been recognized in his time as the one proper possessor of the chair—and so on right back to the foundation of the particular local church. And if that church was an apostolic church in the fullest sense, the first bishop had been installed in his post by an apostle : if on the other hand (as would rather have been the case in the later second century with most of the Christian communities) the church in question had been founded as an offshoot by the missionary energy of some older church, then of course the daughter church would trace her genealogy back beyond her own foundation through the successive bishops of the mother church, until in this way an apostolic origin was predicable of any church, however recent its separate organization, or however many the steps which intervened

between it and the apostolic church from which it ultimately derived its descent. For instance, the church of Canterbury would trace its apostolic succession from archbishop Davidson back to archbishop Temple, and from archbishop Temple to archbishop Benson, and so back to St Augustine, and from St Augustine to St Gregory who sent him, and from St Gregory back through the succession of bishops of Rome to the apostolic founders St Peter and St Paul[1].

But the appeal in its fullest scope was never to a single line of succession only. Behind even the greatest and most illustrious of these lines there lay in reserve that which gave its strength to each, the consent of all. Not even the church of Rome was, in and by itself, a final witness. There was a *prima facie* case for regarding the doctrine of any single church as apostolic, and with the church of Rome the *prima facie* case was stronger than with any other single church. But the really binding force of the argument was that, if the presumption derived from the tradition of any individual church were questioned, then the churchman could at once fall back on the agreement of this individual church with the other individual churches. The holy Church was catholic as well as apostolic. It was not one line of descent, but many, which linked the Church of Irenaeus and Tertullian with the Church of the Apostles; in brief it was not the Apostolic Succession, but the Apostolic

[1] Cf. Tert. *Praescr. adv. haer.* 20 'apostoli...primo per Iudaeam contestata fide in Iesum Christum et ecclesiis institutis, dehinc in orbem profecti eandem doctrinam eiusdem fidei nationibus promulgaverunt et perinde ecclesias apud unamquamque civitatem condiderunt; a quibus traducem fidei et semina doctrinae ceterae exinde ecclesiae mutuatae sunt, et cotidie mutuantur, ut ecclesiae fiant, ac per hoc et ipsae apostolicae deputabuntur ut soboles apostolicarum ecclesiarum. omne genus ad originem suam censeatur necesse est. itaque tot ac tantae ecclesiae una est illa ab apostolis prima, ex qua omnes. sic omnes primae et omnes apostolicae.' The whole chapter is an admirable summary of this aspect of the question.

Successions, which made the ultimate guarantee of the security of the deposit. 'Ecquid verisimile est ut tot ac tantae ecclesiae in unam fidem erraverint?'

What then were the conditions that had first to be fulfilled before a bishop was recognized as being in the succession from the apostles? It must be remembered that such a question was not formally raised or thoroughly argued or definitely answered, until instances had occurred in which uncertainty was actually felt in regard to the genuineness of some particular claim. Concrete examples in point did crop up in the third century: but we have no reason at all to doubt that, so far back as 'succession' was emphasized at all, two factors and two only were implicitly assumed as necessary elements in the case. To belong to the succession, a bishop had first to be lawfully chosen by a particular community to occupy the vacant *cathedra* of its church, and secondly to be lawfully entrusted with the *charisma* of the episcopate by the ministry of those already recognized as possessing it. When the neighbouring bishops met to bestow on the bishop-elect the laying on of their hands, they in fact ratified with the sanction of the Church at large the choice of the individual community. To settle all the elements of a lawful election or a lawful ordination was a task incumbent only on later generations: principles must be established first, and the rules which apply them had not yet been thought of. But it was certain from the first that any claim to be a bishop in the successions from the apostles meant on the part of the claimant the satisfaction of two conditions—a right relation to the local church, of which he claimed to have been constituted the head, and a right relation to the whole Church, of the Episcopate of which he claimed to have been constituted a member. If he had not received by ordination the *charisma* of the episcopal office, he had no right to govern, or bind and loose, or impart

the gifts of office, because without this *charisma* of his ordination he and his community had nothing to stand upon but their own basis; with it they possessed the whole fellowship and life and virtue of the Church catholic and apostolic. Conversely if, although genuinely ordained to the office of a bishop, he was not the lawful occupant of any particular *cathedra* in the communion of the Church and represented no body of Christian people, then he was not really in any line of the Apostolic Succession. If he was not only not at the head of a community (a 'diocesan' bishop in the language of a later age) but was even outside the Church altogether, in communion with heretics or schismatics of one description or another, then there was no sort of question but that his heresy or schism *ipso facto* ruled out his claim. However clear and irrefragable a descent he could shew from those who had successively received the laying on of hands to the episcopate, he conveyed neither the truth nor the fellowship that came down from the Apostles: only they were in the true succession who were προσκαρτεροῦντες τῇ διδαχῇ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ τῇ κοινωνίᾳ.

II

In the beginnings of Christianity the government of the infant Church was in the hands of the apostles: and the apostolate, both because the credential of an apostle was to have seen the risen Lord and because of the missionary character implied by the very name, was in its essence a temporary thing. But so strong in the early days was the conviction of the nearness of the final cataclysm, that the first Christians would have no more cared than did the Irvingite community of the nineteenth century to proceed upon the assumption that the Church militant would outlast the last of the apostles: even the few cities of Israel would not all

be evangelized before the Son of Man should return. Only when in fact the first Christian generation was passing away and the end had not come, could the idea grow up that a sequence of office-bearers was necessary to the Church to provide for the continued needs of the Christian Society. There could be no thought of succession, until it was clear that there would be vacant places to which to succeed.

But the day came when earlier and simpler conceptions had perforce to be modified. After the rush and swing of the opening years came the inevitable set-back. Joy and hope, courage and high enthusiasm, had been the note of the unceasing advance which, as St Luke describes it, triumphantly carried the Christian mission to its free scope in the capital of the empire. Then had supervened the violent removal of the leaders, James, Peter, Paul; the settled hostility of the State; wars and rumours of wars throughout the world; the fall of the holy City, the destruction of the Temple. The signs that were to presage the end seemed abundantly present, yet the Master's return tarried. It was imperative to grapple with the new situation and its needs. To that aim the fragments that remained over from the fullness of the past, the rich traditions of the first generation, had to be gathered up and set in order and made permanently available. So in these pregnant years the canonical Gospels were committed to writing: so too men turned to the apostolic churches and to the disciples left in charge of them, in the full confidence that all that was essential of the apostles' ministry and oversight would still continue to be dispensed for the lasting possession of those who should follow.

Therefore, as soon as this point was reached and circumstances had brought the Christian Church face to face with an altered state of things, there was no hesitancy about the conclusion to be drawn: 'succession'

is in the air at once, and an assured belief that the apostles had provided for it. The actual phraseology is found in a Christian document of the end of the first century: not, it is true, with regard to bishops, nor quite directly with regard to succession from the apostles, and not without a saving clause as to the tentative nature of any 'succession' in a world so unstable as Christians believed it to be. But it had happened that the community at Corinth had ejected its senior presbyters, or some of them, from office; and whatever were the real motives at work, it seems clear that nothing was urged against the life and conversation of the clergy ejected. Then the Roman church, speaking through Clement as its mouthpiece, sent a serious remonstrance against proceedings which seemed to set at naught the God-given principle of order, as it runs throughout the whole created universe, and therefore through human society at large, and not least through the ministry of divine things in both the Old and the New dispensation.

The offices of the Jewish ministry (so we may summarize the argument of the epistle) were distributed in orderly fashion, so that high priest, priest, levite and layman, had each his several function, and death was the penalty for over-stepping the precise limits which hedged round the worship of the Older Covenant. But the Newer Covenant had an even more binding claim, because it rested on a revelation of fuller knowledge; and this covenant had its ministry as really and authoritatively divine as the other[1]. Through steps and successions the sanction of each order of Christian ministry went back to God Himself. Jesus Christ was sent from God, the apostles from Jesus Christ, the first presbyters and deacons from the apostles. And it made no difference if these first holders of office were dead, and the apostles who had appointed them dead also; since

[1] Clem. *ad Cor.* xl., xli.

the apostles themselves, foreseeing that the ministry would become a subject of contention, had made the requisite provision for continuation of the work. After the original ordainers and the original ordained, there would be other men to be proved and ordained to the ministry, other men of note to prove and ordain them. And the whole community would express its assent to each ordination, so that no element should be lacking to ensure its complete and permanent validity[1].

So much is quite clear: St Clement has in mind, besides the community at large, two pairs or sets of people: (1) the apostles, and those who after their death ordained men to the ministry; (2) the ministers originally ordained by the apostles, and those who after the death of these original ministers were ordained whether by the apostles or by those who for this purpose acted in the apostles' place. And the essential meaning of Clement's argument is not in the least affected by the doubt which has been felt as to the exact construction of the particular sentence in which the reference to succession is found. The apostles not only 'appointed the afore-mentioned [presbyters] but made further provision that, if they fell asleep, other proved men should succeed to their ministry.' But if who 'fell asleep'? and 'succeed to' whose ministry? It is probable that the sentence would be correctly expanded as follows: 'if the afore-mentioned presbyters fell asleep, other proved men should succeed to the

[1] *Ib.* xlii. 1—4: οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἡμῶν εὐηγγελίσθησαν ἀπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐξεπέμφθη· ὁ Χριστὸς οὖν ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ...ἐξῆλθον εὐαγγελιζόμενοι. κατὰ χώρας οὖν καὶ πόλεις κηρύσσοντες καθίστανον τὰς ἀπαρχὰς αὐτῶν, δοκιμάσαντες τῷ πνεύματι, εἰς ἐπισκόπους καὶ διακόνους τῶν μελλόντων πιστεύειν. xliv. 1—3: καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἡμῶν ἔγνωσαν διὰ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ὅτι ἔρις ἔσται ἐπὶ τοῦ ὀνόματος τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς. διὰ ταύτην οὖν τὴν αἰτίαν...κατέστησαν τοὺς προειρημένους, καὶ μεταξὺ ἐπινομὴν δεδώκασιν ὅπως, ἐὰν κοιμηθῶσιν, διαδέξωνται ἕτεροι δεδοκιμασμένοι ἄνδρες τὴν λειτουργίαν αὐτῶν. τοὺς οὖν κατασταθέντας ὑπ' ἐκείνων ἢ μεταξὺ ὑφ' ἑτέρων ἐλλογίμων ἀνδρῶν, συνευδοκησάσης τῆς ἐκκλησίας πάσης, καὶ λειτουργήσαντας ἀμέμπτως...

ministry of the presbyters in question' : for though grammatically it might as well mean 'if the apostles fell asleep, other proved men should succeed in this respect to the apostolic office,' the use of the two words δεδοκιμασμένοι and λειτουργία seems to fix the reference to the presbyters. Δεδοκιμασμένοι 'proved' looks back to the same expression in xlii. 4 ; the apostles in every district and city appointed their first converts, after testing them by the Spirit, δοκιμάσαντες τῷ πνεύματι, to be bishops and deacons of those who should believe. Λειτουργία again is twice used in the immediate context of the ejected presbyters ; xliv. 3 'those who had been appointed...and had ministered blamelessly to the flock of Christ,' λειτουργήσαντας ἀμέμπτως, and xliv. 6 'some of them you have removed...from the ministry which they had blamelessly served.'[1]

It follows that the only succession of which Clement speaks in so many words is the succession of presbyters to their predecessors in office in the local church. But the whole weight of his argument rests on the one principle of a divinely constituted hierarchy, in which every link of the chain is indissolubly bound to the one before it ; and therefore it must be as true in his conception of ordainers as of ordained, that they do what they do because it has been part of God's ordered plan for His people that there should be those who should be now exercising this function which in the first generation had been exercised by the apostles. Like the apostles, they are the notables[2] of the Church : in

[1] In this exegesis of Clem. *ad Cor.* xliv. 2 I take a middle course between Lightfoot *ad loc.*, who (if I understand him rightly) identifies the ἕτεροι δεδοκιμασμένοι ἄνδρες with the ὑφ' ἑτέρων ἐλλογίμων ἀνδρῶν and refers both phrases to the ordained, and Liddon *A Father in Christ* (1885, pp. 10, 35), who also identifies these two sets of people, but understands both of the ordainers.

[2] ἑτέρων ἐλλογίμων ἀνδρῶν. I have borrowed the translation 'notables' of the Church from Prof. Phillimore's '*Philostratus* In honour of Apollonius of Tyana,' p. xviii., 'in the presence of all the Notables (ἐλλόγιμοι) of the capital.'

the apostles' room and place they ordain to the ministry. All things in their due order, is the motto of St Clement as of St Paul[1].

It is of course true, as we should indeed expect, that the elements which go to make up the completed theology of the Christian writers on the subject of the ministry are found separately before they are found in combination. Clement, bishop of Rome though he was, knows nothing at all of the collective episcopate, and still uses ἐπίσκοπος, ἐπισκοπή of presbyters; but we have just seen how firmly he grasps the principle of succession—explicitly, of the succession of presbyters, implicitly, through the survival after the apostles' time of the apostolic function of ordination, of a succession to apostles. Ignatius, on the other hand, lays no emphasis on the idea of succession to office[2]; but he has a very vivid sense of the individual bishop as the centre of unity, and in the background a sense of the sum total of these individual bishops as the expression of the mind of Jesus Christ in the Christian Society. An ordered unity as God's purpose for the Church is the energizing idea in the thought of both fathers: the one emphasizes rather the historical side of developement and succession, and conceives of this as the thread that runs throughout the divine work and connects together past, present, and future; the other dwells on the oneness with one another, in life and belief, of the existing Christian brotherhood, and the key to this oneness he finds in

[1] xl. 1 *πάντα τάξει ποιεῖν ὀφείλομεν*: cf. 1 Cor. xiv. 40.

[2] It is sometimes argued that Ignatius has a succession idea of his own, inconsistent with the later view; presbyters being the successors of the apostles, and the bishop rather of Christ (Hatch *Bampton Lectures*[2] pp. 106, 107 and note 47). But he has no thought of 'succession' at all. The bishop has the authority of God or of Christ; the presbyters are a body surrounding him and depending on him, as the apostles surrounded and were dependent on Christ: *Trall.* 2, 3, *Philad.* 5, *Smyrn.* 8. But also the relation of bishop and people is like that of God and Christ: *Magn.* 7, *Smyrn.* 8. Ignatius has one theme, expressed in many metaphors.

the loyal correspondence of presbyters and people with the mind of their bishop, and of the bishop with the mind of Christ. Clement's conception of unity, if one may venture the phrase, is vertical, while that of Ignatius is horizontal. To both the apostles are the pillars of the Church, the unquestioned legislators of the Christian commonwealth. Peter and Paul are singled out, as by Clement so by Ignatius: in contrast with them Ignatius feels himself a common criminal going to his death, though it be a death of martyrdom[1]. 'The apostles and the Church' are the adequate expression of the New Covenant, as 'Abraham and Isaac and Jacob and the prophets' of the Old[2]. Christianity is not at all to Ignatius a body of rules or definitions: but the Magnesians are to aim at being made steadfast in the 'dogmas' of the Lord and the apostles, just as the Trallians are to be 'inseparable from Jesus Christ and from the bishop and from the ordinances of the apostles.'[3] We are not to think that δόγματα τῶν ἀποστόλων means formally an apostolic Creed, or διατάγματα τῶν ἀποστόλων anything like a code of apostolic Canons. But at the same time it is amply clear that to St Ignatius the authority of the apostles does lie behind the Christian system of his day; they had impressed certain features on the Church's life, they had started its career on certain lines, its developement could only move within certain limits. St Ignatius believed in the Apostolate, he believed in episcopacy: if his argument did not lead him so far as to establish the precise relation of the one to the other, there is nothing in St Irenaeus' doctrine of apostolic succession but what is germane to his thought and conforms itself naturally to his premisses.

[1] Clem. *ad Cor.* v.: Ign. *Rom.* 4, *Trall.* 3.
[2] Ign. *Philad.* 9.
[3] Ign. *Magn.* 13; *Trall.* 7.

Such Christian literature as has come to us from the half-century that intervenes between Ignatius and Hegesippus is concerned for the most part with the external relations of the Church. The controversy with Paganism took the characteristic form of Apologies, the controversy with Judaism that of Disputations between Jew and Christian; neither Apologies nor Dialogues can be expected to throw light on the history or doctrine of the Christian ministry. Even the *Shepherd* of Hermas contains hardly more to our purpose: certainly, as the one thing we are told about it is that Hermas wrote it under the episcopate of his brother Pius at Rome, it was not felt in its own day to possess any of that anti-episcopal flavour which some modern scholars have been prone to find in it.

With Hegesippus we plunge into the full heyday of the Gnostic controversy, and his work, the five books of Ὑπομνήματα[1], was, to judge from the scanty fragments that remain, doctrinal in character and controversial in its aim. The idea that he was a historian is probably due to the fact that nearly all we know whether of him or of his work comes from the church historian Eusebius, who names or quotes him not infrequently, and naturally picks out historical matter to quote. With only two exceptions, the quotations

[1] Eusebius gives no title to the work. When Jerome, *de vir. ill.* 22, writes 'omnes a passione Domini usque ad suam aetatem ecclesiasticorum actuum texens historias,' he is only paraphrasing and expanding after his manner: there is no reason to think he had ever seen a copy, and we must certainly not assume a Greek title πέντε ὑπομνήματα ἐκκλησιαστικῶν πράξεων. But Stephen Gobar (as quoted by Photius *Bibliotheca* cod. ccxxxii. 13) writes definitely Ἡγήσιππος ἀρχαῖός τε ἀνὴρ καὶ ἀποστολικὸς ἐν τῷ πέμπτῳ τῶν Ὑπομνημάτων, and Hegesippus himself (ap. Eus. *H.E.* ii. 23. 8) τῶν αἱρέσεων τῶν προγεγραμμένων μοι ἐν τοῖς Ὑπομνήμασι: add to these indications that Eusebius uses the verb ὑπομνηματίζεσθαι (*H.E.* iv. 8. 2), and Epiphanius apparently the noun ὑπομνηματισμοί (*Haer.* xxvii. 6, xxix. 4), in reference to the work, and we shall conclude that Hegesippus published under the unambitious title *My Note-book: in Five Parts*, just as Clement issued *Eight Volumes of my Rag-bags*. On the general character of Hegesippus' work see Lawlor *Eusebiana* (1912), Essay I.

relate to the affairs of the church of Palestine—the martyrdom of St James the Just, the story of the grandsons of St Jude, the martyrdom of Symeon. But Hegesippus, even supposing he was a Jew by descent or it may be an actual convert from Judaism, did not write in any Judaizing interest; he had selected these topics simply to illustrate the picture of the rise and growth of Gnostic heresy. Until the reign of Trajan—that is, at any rate till about 100 A.D.—Symeon being still bishop of Jerusalem, and the grandsons of Jude presiding over other (doubtless Palestinian) communities, the Church remained virgin and uncorrupt: her unity had not yet been shattered by the canker of words uttered against 'God and His Christ.' The starting-point of all Christian heresies Hegesippus finds in the already existing 'heresies' among the Jews: from the 'Essenes, Galileans, Hemerobaptists, Masbotheans, Samaritans, Sadducees, Pharisees' came Simon, Cleobius, Dositheus and so on, with their followers: from them in turn 'Menandrianists and Marcionists and Carpocratians and Valentinians and Basilidians and Satornilians.' False Christs, false prophets, false apostles: Hegesippus almost seems to conceive of the history and propagation of heresy as a sort of pseudo-apostolic succession[1].

Although Hegesippus thus looked back to Jerusalem, both for the scene of that golden age of the Church in which heresy had as yet no place and for the source of all the Gnostic errors that were in circulation in his own day, his vision was in no sense limited to the horizon of Jewish Christianity. The crucial years of his literary activity were spent among the Gentile churches, and, as it would seem, in fullest sympathy with their larger life. In the second century the current of

[1] ἀπὸ τῶν ἑπτὰ αἱρέσεων...ἀφ' ὧν...ἀπὸ τούτων...ἀπὸ τούτων, ap. Eus. *H.E.* iv. 22. 5, 6. So Irenaeus speaks of Marcion as 'succeeding' Cerdo, *Haer.* I. xxvii. 1; but perhaps rather as one head of a philosophical school 'succeeded' another. Later Gnostics, like Ptolemaeus, did claim a 'succession' to the apostolic tradition. See Note, pp. 200, 201.

religious movement was setting strongly towards the capital: Rome was the stage on which the contest was to be fought for the inheritance of the dying paganism of the old world. Gnostics and Catholics, Valentinus and Cerdo and Marcion and Marcellina, Justin and Tatian, all gravitated Romewards: Hegesippus followed in their steps. He came while Anicetus was bishop, and stayed apparently throughout the eight years of the episcopate of Soter into the time of Eleutherus: under Eleutherus, therefore at earliest about 175, he published his treatise[1]. But if Hegesippus had not been a merely Jerusalem Christian, neither did he become a merely Roman Christian. On his way to Rome he had stayed, for instance, some time in Corinth, and had investigated the history of the local church: he heard about the letter which Clement had written them from Rome; he satisfied himself that the traditions and the teaching of the church were alike orthodox. In Eusebius' paraphrase of his account of himself, 'he interviewed numerous bishops, and from all he received the same doctrine.' To be a Catholic Christian meant that neither the church of Jerusalem nor the church of Rome nor any local church bore exclusive witness to the truth: that was to be found in the consent of the churches, and in their joint fidelity as guardians of the common tradition.

So it comes about that in defending the faith of the Church against the heresies, Hegesippus laid stress on the idea of the successions. Not only is he the first extant writer to use the verb διαδέχεσθαι of one bishop succeeding another[2]; still more remarkable is his employment of the noun διαδοχή for a list of the

1 On the chronology of Hegesippus' life see the fuller discussion of the evidence of Eusebius, *infra* p. 207.

2 ap. Eus. *H.E.* iv. 22. 3 παρὰ Ἀνικήτου διαδέχεται Σωτήρ. Note the use of παρά and genitive in place of the ordinary accusative after διαδέχεσθαι: perhaps he meant to indicate the thought of a trust handed over from one to the other.

episcopal successions. He sums up his experience of the homogeneity of the tradition, and of its correspondence both to the Scriptures of his Jewish ancestors and to the teaching of Christ: 'in every succession and in every city the preaching of the Law and the Prophets and the Lord is faithfully followed.'[1] Arrived in Rome, his first thought was to draw up a succession-list, a genealogy as we might call it, of the Roman episcopate down to Anicetus[2]. That this list has actually been preserved, there is now good reason to believe; bishop Lightfoot made it more than probable that Hegesippus was used by Epiphanius, and that in particular the catalogue of Roman bishops in *Haer.* xxvii. 6, which begins with SS. Peter and Paul and ends with Anicetus, came straight out of the Ὑπομνήματα[3]. It does not matter for our present purpose whether Lightfoot is right or no: what matters is that Hegesippus did draw up a list, and called it a διαδοχή, and knew and utilized the evidence of many other successions as well, and pressed the agreement of their teaching with one another and with the Scriptures as the conclusion of the whole matter.

That is practically the complete doctrine of the Successions as we get it in Irenaeus, only without the epithet 'apostolic.' How far can we say that, though the word is absent, the sense of it is there?

[1] ap. Eus. *H.E.* iv. 22. 3 ἐν ἑκάστῃ διαδοχῇ καὶ ἐν ἑκάστῃ πόλει οὕτως ἔχει ὡς ὁ Νόμος κηρύσσει καὶ οἱ Προφῆται καὶ ὁ Κύριος.

[2] *ib.* γενόμενος δὲ ἐν Ῥώμῃ διαδοχὴν ἐποιησάμην μέχρις Ἀνικήτου, 'I made out for myself a succession': the phrase is odd, but it is not much odder than ἐν ἑκάστῃ διαδοχῇ. Obviously the word was already technical to Hegesippus, the symbol of a whole theory: compare the passages collected in the appended Notes, pp. 197 ff. 199 ff. The egregious proposal to read διατριβὴν ἐποιησάμην comes to grief on the simple fact that Hegesippus did not 'make a stay till Anicetus,' but arrived under Anicetus and made a stay till Eleutherus: Eus. *H.E.* iv. 11. 7 Ἀνίκητος...καθ' ὃν Ἡγήσιππος ἱστορεῖ ἑαυτὸν ἐπιδημῆσαι τῇ Ῥώμῃ παραμεῖναί τε αὐτόθι μέχρι τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς Ἐλευθέρου. Eusebius had the whole of Hegesippus before him, and we have not.

[3] Lightfoot *S. Clement of Rome* i. 328—333.

If we can trust the summaries which Eusebius gives of the book and its argument, the question is answered; for they shew the place and function of the apostles in not less clear relief than do Clement and Ignatius and Irenaeus. 'Hegesippus,' says the historian (*H.E.* iv. 8. 2), 'recorded in five books in the simplest style the undeviating tradition of the apostolic preaching.'[1] At an earlier point he had paraphrased Hegesippus' contrast between the virgin state of the Church, in the first and golden age, and the later prevalence of heresy (*ib.* iii. 32. 7): till the death of Symeon 'the Church remained pure and undefiled, while those whose aim it was to corrupt the sound rule of the preaching of salvation, if as yet there were any such, were lurking in obscurity. But after the glorious company of the apostles had reached in one way or another the term of life, and the generation had passed of those who had been accounted worthy to hear with their own ears the Inspired Wisdom, then godless error began to take form and shape, and false teachers, seeing that none of the apostles still survived, threw off all disguise and openly tried to oppose their so-called *gnosis* to the preaching of the Truth.' It is likely that these sentences owe to Eusebius not only their phraseology but something of their tone: yet if they represent even roughly the drift of the original, Hegesippus too must have conceived of the successions as being, fundamentally, the successions from the apostles.

But there may perhaps be another answer to the question why Hegesippus did not, so far as we know, qualify the episcopal successions as definitely 'apostolic.' Where the fragments are so few, it is only too easy to lay undue stress on a single phrase: nevertheless the phrase is there which brings the apostles themselves into the line of succession and puts its starting-point behind them. As Clement had written 'the apostles

[1] *τὴν ἁπλανῆ παράδοσιν τοῦ ἀποστολικοῦ κηρύγματος.*

from Christ,' so Hegesippus writes 'together with the apostles James the Lord's brother succeeded to the government of the Church.'[1] It is difficult to see that this can mean anything except succession to our Lord Himself. Just as Ignatius is not belittling the bishop's office when he compares him to Christ, so Hegesippus is not belittling the successions when he traces them back behind the apostles to their Master.

Hegesippus is principally important because he brings us evidence, independent of that of St Irenaeus, for the place which the argument from the successions held in the Christian thought of the day. Not only does he represent a quite different local tradition—Palestine instead of Asia Minor, Rome instead of Gaul—but though he may have been no older than Irenaeus[2], he certainly developed interest in the successions at an earlier date than we have any reason to suppose that Irenaeus did. His testimony therefore contributes to the conclusion that emphasis on the successions is no invention of Irenaeus: it grew naturally, as the introductory pages of this chapter have tried to shew, out of the crisis which all supporters of the Catholic cause were called, in the latter half of the second century, to face. But for all that it was St Irenaeus who first gave classic expression to the doctrine of Apostolic Succession, and the sketch of its meaning given on pp. 104—108 is an attempt to lead up to the position expounded in the *adversus Haereses*. Just for that reason, because the general idea has been made clear, it will not be necessary to do more than cite some principal passages where Irenaeus emphasizes the Catholic appeal to the episcopate, as the abiding witness to the grace and truth which had been with the Church from the beginning.

The main outlines of Irenaeus' life are well enough

[1] ap. Eus. *H.E.* ii. 23. 4 διαδέχεται τὴν ἐκκλησίαν.

[2] See note on the chronology of Hegesippus' life, p. 207.

known. He was born in Asia Minor somewhere about 125—130 A.D.: as a young man he had sat at the feet of St Polycarp, bishop of Smyrna, and at the time of Polycarp's death (155, or more probably 156) he appears to have been living in Rome. But Gaul, and Lyons the capital of Gaul, was the home of his maturer life; when the great persecution of 177 broke out in the Rhone valley, he was a priest of the church of Lyons, and was deputed in that year to confer with pope Eleutherus about the Montanist movement, which commanded more sympathy in Gaul than it did at Rome. At Rome he is said to have delivered a course of lectures, and to have had among his auditors the youthful Hippolytus. In the same year he became bishop of Lyons in the room of the martyred Pothinus; he was still living when the Easter question disturbed the harmony of the churches towards the end of the century, and once more intervened at Rome in the same irenic character—'"Peaceful" by name and nature,' as Eusebius puts it. This is the last we know of him: Gallic tradition, not perhaps very well attested, makes him earn the beatitude not only of the peacemakers but of those who suffer for righteousness' sake; he is said to have fallen a victim to the persecution of Severus in 202.

Of all his writings the most distinguished, and the only one which concerns us here, is the *adversus Haereses*, or in its original Greek title Ἔλεγχος καὶ ἀνατροπὴ τῆς ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως, 'Exposure and refutation of knowledge falsely so called,' composed under the episcopate of Eleutherus, say about 180—185 A.D.: a work of immense (if unequal) merit, whether for its careful explanation of Gnostic systems, its wealth of scriptural learning, or its profound grasp of Christian truth. One would say 'charm' as well as 'merit,' for St Irenaeus' theology is as attractive as his personality, if it were not that the modern student is handicapped

by the loss of the Greek original. Apart from the *exposé* in the first book—Irenaeus, like Hegesippus, divides his work into five books—of the tenets of the various schools of Valentinian Gnostics, which Hippolytus and Epiphanius between them have preserved almost entire, little has come down to us in the Greek: and the text of the few citations made in Greek fathers or Greek *florilegia* has suffered, as such citations are apt to do, from accommodation to this or that dogmatic interest. Fortunately a translator, at some date between Irenaeus and Augustine, rendered the whole into Latin; and if his version is somewhat bald, it is at the same time exceedingly faithful.

The portions of St Irenaeus' great work which best repay study are the third and fourth books; and it is also to these two books that the three passages belong in which he has occasion to speak most definitely about the apostolic successions.

a. 'When we refute the heretics from Scripture,' says Irenaeus at the beginning of the third book[1], 'they appeal from the written to the unwritten tradition of the apostles. We are quite willing to accept the appeal. We can shew, to anyone whose eyes are open to the facts, this tradition from the apostles in manifest form in every Christian community throughout the world. We can give the names of the bishops whom the apostles appointed in the several churches, with the list of their successors from that day down to this; and no one of them thought or taught anything like the fantasies of the Gnostics. Yet if the apostles had had a reserve of secret mysteries, in which they instructed the "perfect" to the exclusion of the rest, they would naturally have chosen for its first recipients just those disciples to whom they were committing the care of the churches: since the men whom they

[1] *Adv. Haer.* III. ii. 1—iv. 1. The English rendering given in the text is meant to be rather a close paraphrase than a literal translation.

most wanted to be "perfect" and at all points irreproachable would be those whom they were leaving as their successors and placing in their own teaching chair—if these did well the benefit would be great, if these failed the harm would be disastrous. Within the modest limits of the present work it would take too long to enumerate the successions in all the churches; I confine myself therefore to one church, the greatest most ancient and best known of all, the church founded at Rome by the two glorious apostles Peter and Paul, and I will shew how the tradition which this church received from the apostles, and the faith which even then was spoken of throughout the world, has by the succession of its bishops been conveyed down to our own time....The blessed apostles having founded and built up the church put into the hands of Linus the ministry of the episcopate....His successor was Anencletus; after him in the third place from the apostles Clement is allotted the episcopate....This Clement was succeeded by Euarestus, and Euarestus by Alexander: next Xystus was appointed, sixth from the apostles, and after him Telesphorus, who died gloriously as a martyr; then Hyginus, then Pius, after whom was Anicetus. Soter succeeded Anicetus, and now, in the twelfth place from the apostles, Eleutherus is the actual occupant of the see. In this order and through this succession[1] the tradition set in the Church by the apostles, and the truth as proclaimed by them, has reached to our time.'

Irenaeus goes on to supplement the Roman tradition by the Asiatic tradition of the churches of Smyrna—that is, of Polycarp, made bishop by apostles, and of his successors to the date of writing—and of Ephesus,

1 'hac ordinatione et successione' Iren.-lat.: τῇ αὐτῇ τάξει καὶ τῇ αὐτῇ διδαχῇ Iren.-gr. (Eusebius): obviously a more familiar word has crept, in the Greek citation, into the place of the technical word διαδοχή. The passages themselves are cited in Greek (or Latin) p. 200.

which united the memories of St Paul and St John. 'With so many lines of proof, why should we seek elsewhere for the truth which we can get thus easily from the Church; for into it, as into a capacious vessel, the apostles poured prodigally all that there is of truth, in order that he who wills may draw from it the water of life. This is the door of life: all others are thieves and robbers.'

b. The passage just given has amply indicated the broad traits of the thought of St Irenaeus on its historical side. His theological position he works out further in two passages, not quite so simple, in the second half of the fourth book. In IV. xxvi. 2—5 he discusses the marks of the true presbyter[1], and rules out those kinds of 'elder' who, failing to pass one or other of his tests, are excluded from that succession from the apostles to which he makes his appeal. 'Those "elders" only have a right to our allegiance who are within the Church; who have their succession from the apostles; who together with the succession to the episcopate have received, according to the good pleasure of the Father, the assured *charisma* of the truth. Other "elders" there are who stand aloof from the main succession[2] and worship apart: these are suspect, as either

[1] Why does Irenaeus, in this passage (and cf. III. ii. 2, IV. xxxii. 1), sometimes use 'presbyter' where we should expect 'episcopus'? (1) It is possible, but not at all likely, that 'presbyter' renders here some other word than πρεσβύτερος. (2) πρεσβύτερος is used by him elsewhere of bishops of an older generation, οἱ πρὸ Σωτῆρος πρεσβύτεροι ap. Eus. *H.E.* v. 24. 14, 'the fathers before Soter'—just as ὁ πρεσβύτερος Ἰωάννης means really 'Father John'—but the sense of 'antiquity' is not in point here. (3) It is more probable that a more general word for office than ἐπίσκοπος is here designedly used, because he will not give the name of bishop to those who are no true bishops. (4) And the more general word has the further advantage that it suggests to him the application of the parallel of the πρεσβύτεροι in the story of Susanna.

[2] 'a principali successione': comparing 'principalis consessionis' a few sentences further on, we may be fairly sure that the reference in both cases is to the bishop and his *cathedra*. Every true bishop, that is to say, belonged to this 'principalis successio.'

(i) heretics and evil thinkers, or (ii) self-pleasing and self-satisfied schismatics, or (iii) hypocrites actuated by love of money or of reputation. There is nothing new in this. Heretics bring in their strange doctrines as Nadab and Abihu brought strange fire to the altar of God, and intrigue against the Church and its truth as Korah Dathan and Abiram rebelled against Moses. Schismatics rend the Church's unity, as Jeroboam rent the Jewish kingdom. Elders or rather pseudo-elders of the Church, if they take pride in the chief seats and oppress their fellow-Christians and work evil in secret, are like the "elders" in Daniel, "grown old in wickedness," "a seed of Canaan and not of Judah."[1] All such we must shun, and cleave to those who keep the apostles' doctrine, and combine with holy orders soundness in word and conduct without offence....Such are the "elders" nurtured by the Church, "bishops given in righteousness," "faithful and wise stewards, rulers over the household of God." If it is asked where these are to be found, St Paul will supply the answer: "In the Church God set first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers." Where then the gifts of the Lord are set, there must we learn His truth—at the side of those who have the Church's succession from the apostles, whose life and teaching are both beyond reproach.'

It is clear that not only heretics but schismatics are ruled out from the succession as St Irenaeus conceives it; and not only heretical or schismatical bishops, but orthodox bishops whose lives give the lie to their profession. Like Cyprian, Irenaeus would have bidden the flock separate themselves from an unworthy pastor; it is doubtful whether he would not have said that the unworthiness of the minister, at least if it were open and notorious, did actually nullify the sacraments conveyed by his ministry; certainly his argument

[1] Daniel xiii. (LXX) 52, 56.

implies that a bishop justly ejected, whether on grounds of faith or of morals, from his bishopric, ceased from that moment—however incontrovertibly he had once been linked to the Catholic succession—to possess any episcopal character, and his ministerial acts would be simply null. A bishop in the primitive view was not really conceivable apart from his church and people.

c. The third and last passage to be examined here occurs later on in the same book, IV. xxxii. 1—xxxiii. 8: and whatever else is obscure in it, the attitude to schism as distinct from heresy is once more clear enough. The believer, Irenaeus argues, who has diligently studied the Scriptures under those who are 'elders' in the Church and possess the doctrine of the apostles, will find the whole argument hang together, 'omnis sermo ei constabit'; he will be the true recipient of the Spirit of God, the spiritual man who judges all men and is judged by none. He will judge the heathen and the Jews, Marcionites and Valentinians, Ebionites, Docetists, false prophets[1]. 'He will judge also them that make schisms, who are empty of the love of God, and look to their own benefit rather than to the union of the Church, who for any and every reason will maim and mutilate and as far as in them lies destroy the great and glorious Body of Christ; speaking peace and working war; truly "straining out the gnat and swallowing the camel," seeing that no reformation they can effect can be as great as is the harm of schism....But he himself will be judged of none, for to him all things hold together into One God Almighty, of whom are all things; his faith is whole-hearted in the Son of God, Christ Jesus our Lord, through whom are all things, and in the economy of the Incarnation; his persuasion is firmly fixed upon the Spirit of God; to him true *gnosis* means the doctrine of the apostles, and the primitive

[1] Perhaps Marcosians rather than Montanists are meant: *adv. Haer.* I. xiii. 3.

constitution of the Church throughout the world[1], and the form of the Body of Christ according to the successions of the bishops to whom the apostles entrusted the several churches....But more precious than knowledge, more glorious than prophecy, excellent above all other *charismata*, is the especial gift of charity.'

Does St Irenaeus, by this emphatic climax, mean to be tempering the rigour of a conception which might seem to leave no room for the working of the Spirit elsewhere than in the visible Body of Christ? Perhaps not: his thought is rather that no one penetrated by the charity of which St Paul had spoken could lend himself to so uncharitable an action as schism. Like St Augustine he would say that, though the Gnostic might have the gift of knowledge or the gift of prophecy, or this or that other gift, yet the greatest gift of the Spirit is charity, and charity implies unity: no schismatic bodies had any right to expect the indwelling of the Spirit. 'Ubi ecclesia, ibi et Spiritus Dei: et ubi Spiritus Dei, illic ecclesia et omnis gratia.'[2] The one Spirit and the one Body are relative each to the other: as the physical breath of life in created matter, so is the Spirit in the Church: and this Church has a form impressed on her from the beginning, 'character corporis Christi secundum successiones episcoporum.'

The great theologians of the next two generations take up the doctrine of the succession on the lines laid down by St Irenaeus. It will suffice to give only very brief illustrations from their language, since passages have already been cited in the first essay of this book which illustrate the position in that respect of Tertullian, Hippolytus, and Origen.

'The order of our bishops,' 'the orderly succession

[1] Γνῶσις ἀληθὴς ἡ τῶν ἀποστόλων διδαχὴ καὶ τὸ ἀρχαῖον τῆς ἐκκλησίας σύστημα κατὰ παντὸς τοῦ κόσμου.

[2] *Adv. Haer.* III. xxiv. 1.

from the apostles,' is a common thought which binds in union to one another, and to the tradition formulated by St Irenaeus, writers as dissimilar as the two great luminaries of Eastern and Western Christianity in the early third century, Tertullian and Origen. Both writers suffered eclipse, not altogether justly, in the narrower vision of some later generations; and if Origen has at last come by his own, every prejudice of the twentieth century is still outraged by Tertullian. But marred though Tertullian's gifts must seem to us to be by the defect of the 'praecipuum dilectionis munus'—and it was perhaps just this defect which landed him in schism—his passionate zeal, his relentless logic, his triumphant irony, go to make up a style magnificently virile; and the greater the emphasis we lay on the difference between the character and temper of the two theologians, the more significant it is to find, as evidenced in the passages quoted above[1], that the appeal to the apostolic succession was entirely common ground to churchmen of such opposite types.

To the quotations already made from the *Praescriptio adversus haereticos* of Tertullian's early and orthodox days another may be added from the greatest of his works, the *adversus Marcionem*, in order to shew that the argument from the apostolic succession of the episcopate was part of his regular equipment in the Gnostic controversy. 'Finally, if it is thus clear that that is truest which is first, and that is first which is from the beginning, and that is from the beginning which is from the apostles, it will be equally clear that that will be the apostolic tradition which is venerated as such in the churches of the apostles. For witness there are the Pauline churches, and our neighbour church of Rome to which both Peter and Paul left a gospel sealed with their blood: there are also the Johannine churches, the succession of whose bishops when traced back to the

[1] Pp. 47, 50: see also pp. 201, 202 *infra*.

beginning will be found to have its fixed starting-point in John.'[1]

Alike to Irenaeus, to Hegesippus, and to Tertullian, bishops have their place in the apostolic succession only in connexion with the churches over which they preside. Sacerdotal language, strictly speaking, is entirely absent from these writers: perhaps it would be true to say that it begins to make its appearance in Hippolytus, since to Hippolytus, so far as lies on the surface of his text, succession from the apostles seems to be a personal possession of the bishop[2]. The gift of the Spirit, the *charisma* of the high-priesthood and teaching office, belongs in his conception to the individual bishop as such. For the first time, apparently, the bishops are not merely in the succession from the apostles, but they are themselves 'successors of' the apostles. And not only διάδοχος but another significant word, ἀρχιερατεία[3], is a novel term in Christian theology. It is not likely that the underlying thought of Hippolytus differed greatly from that of St Irenaeus; but perhaps we may see, in the stress on one side of the conception, the first move towards

[1] 'ordo episcoporum ad originem recensus in Iohannem stabit auctorem,' *adv. Marc.* iv. 5.

[2] The Greek of the crucial passage from the preface to the first book of the *Philosophumena* runs as follows (an English translation has been given above, p. 48): ταῦτα δὲ ἕτερος οὐκ ἐλέγξει ἢ τὸ ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ παραδοθὲν ἅγιον πνεῦμα, οὗ τυχόντες πρότεροι οἱ ἀπόστολοι μετέδοσαν τοῖς ὀρθῶς πεπιστευκόσιν· ὧν ἡμεῖς διάδοχοι τυγχάνοντες, τῆς τε αὐτῆς χάριτος μετέχοντες ἀρχιερατείας τε καὶ διδασκαλίας, καὶ φρουροὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας λελογισμένοι, οὐ...λόγον ὀρθὸν σιωπῶμεν.

[3] It is worth noting that the corresponding verb and adjective are also used—for the first time, so far as I know, in Christian writers—in the ordination prayer for a bishop in the *Church Order* which has now been vindicated for Hippolytus (I give the Greek as restored from the Verona Latin with the aid of the Greek of the *Constitutiones per Hippolytum*), τὸν δοῦλόν σου τοῦτον ὃν ἐξελέξω εἰς ἐπισκοπὴν ... ἀρχιερατεύειν σοι ἀμέμπτως λειτουργοῦντα, and τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἀρχιερατικῷ ἔχειν ἐξουσίαν ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας. Moreover, there is the same emphasis, both in this ordination prayer and in the passage of the *Philosophumena*, on the gift of the Spirit to the apostles and to bishops alike.

the evolution of the new theory as we shall find it worked out in the theology of St Augustine.

From the Cyprianic literature three specimens may be adduced which shew how largely the succession from the apostles had become a commonplace in the Christian thought of the third century; for they come respectively from St Cyprian himself, from one of his suffragans, and from his correspondent St Firmilian of Caesarea. In the indignant *apologia pro vita sua* evoked by the calumnious insinuations of a certain bishop Puppianus, Cyprian writes: 'You would set yourself up as judge of God and of Christ who said to His apostles, and so to all prelates who succeed to the apostles by appointment in their room, "He that heareth you heareth me, and he that heareth me heareth him that sent me; and he that rejecteth you, rejecteth me and him that sent me."'[1] So Firmilian a little later, in the controversy about heretical baptism: 'Only on the apostles did Christ breathe and say "Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whose soever sins ye remit, they shall be remitted unto him, and whose soever sins ye retain, they shall be retained." Thus authority for remitting sins was given to the apostles, and to the churches which as Christ's missionaries they founded, and to the bishops who succeeded to them by appointment in their room.'[2] So too Clarus of Mascula, a Numidian bishop voting 79th in the great Rebaptism Council of Sept. 1, A.D. 256: 'Manifest is the vote of our Lord Jesus Christ; for He sent forth His apostles and confided to them alone the authority given Him from the Father—

[1] *Ep.* lxvi. (written in the sixth year of Cyprian's episcopate, therefore about A.D. 253—254) 4, Hartel 729, 18, 'ad omnes praepositos qui apostolis vicaria ordinatione succedunt.' 'Ordinatio' here includes, but is not limited to, the rite of ordination: 'vicaria ordinatio' is illustrated by the parallel in *ep.* lviii. (656, 14) 'pro me ad vos vicarias litteras misi,' i.e. a letter in place of his presence; compare too 'per temporum et successionum vices' *ep.* xxxiii. 1 (566, 10). See p. 202 *infra*.

[2] ap. Cypr. *ep.* lxxv. 16, Hartel 831, 1.

and we have succeeded to the apostles, and govern the Church by the same authority as they.'[1]

Firmilian's letter was of course written in Greek: and in its extant Latin dress, while the matter is no doubt the writer's, the phraseology may be the translator's, and to the latter may be due the reappearance of the phrase already noted in St Cyprian, 'ordinatione vicaria succedere.' But to Firmilian himself we must certainly attribute the stress on the churches founded by the apostles, which puts him into the direct tradition of Irenaeus, while Cyprian and his suffragan Clarus stand in nearer relation to Hippolytus. Not only do both Africans, like Hippolytus and indeed Firmilian also, speak of themselves—in the plural, no doubt, not in the singular: the order of bishops rather than their individual selves—as 'successors' of the apostles[2]; but to both of them, as to Hippolytus, the Church takes the place of the churches[3], so that the bishop is rather *a* bishop of the Church at large than *the* bishop of his own community; the common relation of the episcopal order to the Church Catholic tends to assume bigger proportions, while the individual relation of each as representing and expressing the tradition of a particular group of Christian people tends by comparison to retire into the background[4]. There is of course no necessary antagonism between these two conceptions, which when

[1] *Sent. Epp.* 79: Hartel 459, 7.

[2] Cypr. *ep.* xlv. 3 (602, 18) 'unitatem a Domino et per apostolos nobis successoribus traditam.' Firmilian (821, 8) 'qui apostolis successimus.' Clarus (459, 9) 'apostolos...quibus nos successimus.' It is tempting to see a literary dependence of Clarus, 'quibus nos successimus eadem potestate ecclesiam Domini gubernantes,' upon the *ὧν ἡμεῖς διάδοχοι...τῆς αὐτῆς χάριτος μετέχοντες...φρουροὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας* of Hippolytus; though, if so, the substitution of 'authority' for 'grace' marks another stage in the growing one-sidedness of the tradition.

[3] Cypr. *ep.* xxxiii. 1 (566, 10) 'episcoporum ordinatio et *ecclesiae* ratio decurrit.' Clarus *l.c.* '*ecclesiam* Domini gubernantes.'

[4] For St Cyprian's apparent identification of the episcopate and apostolate, see below p. 140: his general theory of the Ministry is dealt with in the next Essay, pp. 215 ff.

held in equipoise complement and correct one another. But a shifting of the emphasis on to one side of the truth can be felt at work from the beginning of the third century; and it marks the first stage of a long and far-reaching developement, in the course of which an integral element of the doctrine in its original form, namely the relation of the bishop to his own people, and consequently their indirect share in the Apostolic Succession, dwindled and disappeared.

III

Origen died in 253, Cyprian in 258, Dionysius of Alexandria about 265: external difficulties ceased with the toleration edict of Gallienus in 261, and the history of doctrine after the final ejection of Paul of Samosata from the see of Antioch presents for the time as complete a blank as the history of persecution. The quarter of a century preceding the Edict of Diocletian in 303 is probably barer of events and of literature than any other twenty-five years in the annals of the Christian Church. There is a contrast between what stands on one side and on the other of this gap as real as the more familiar opposition between the age of persecutions and the age of councils.

The gap is bridged, so far as it is bridged at all, by the life-work of Eusebius of Caesarea; for Eusebius, though in date he is rather the precursor and advance guard of the great literary movement of the fourth century, is for us primarily the father of Church History, the man whose careful piety towards the past has collected and preserved so much that would otherwise have perished irrevocably of the memorials of the first Christian ages. And to Eusebius, with this main object in view, the successions from the apostles take on a

new import, neither doctrinal, as with St Irenaeus and the writers of whom we have so far spoken, nor sacramental, as in the modern conception, but primarily historical.

In this sense of course the episcopal successions do not stand in the same unique position with regard to other forms of succession, as they necessarily do where the emphasis is sacramental or doctrinal. Irenaeus taught that in the apostolic successions of the bishops lay a divinely ordered guarantee for the truth of Christian doctrine, others have found in them a similar guarantee for the reality of Christian sacraments; in either case the argument is exclusive in the sense that no other succession gave or could give the guarantee at all. But to the historian no form of succession can come wholly amiss: the succession of teachers in a school or university, the succession of theologians in the Church generally, even the succession of one generation of churchmen to another, are all factors of that complex of continuity and developement which is what we mean by history. So Dionysius the Great 'succeeds to' the headship of the catechetical school at Alexandria, just as Anatolius of Laodicea is said to have directed the school of the Aristotelian 'succession' in the same city. At Jerusalem the chair of St James was displayed to visitors by 'the brethren who are its successive guardians there'; and there too the stories of the wonder-working bishop Narcissus were related 'as handed down in the succession of the brethren.' Hegesippus is introduced as belonging to 'the first succession from the apostles,' and in the same way Clement of Alexandria was 'near the succession from the apostles'[1]—in both these citations the meaning appears to be 'belonged' (or 'almost belonged') 'to the

[1] *H.E.* vi. 29. 4, vii. 32. 6: vii. 19, vi. 9. 1: ii. 23. 3, vi. 13. 8. The quotations themselves will be found in the appended Note, p. 203 f.

sub-apostolic age'[1]: Clement also 'indicates the more eminent men of the apostolic succession to which he reached back,' where Eusebius' phrase is no doubt intended to echo Clement's own words about his teachers quoted in the same chapter, 'these men preserving the true tradition of the blessed teaching straight from the holy apostles Peter and James, John and Paul, son following father (though few are the sons that are like their fathers), came under God right down to our time, to sow among us the fruitful seed of an apostolic faith.'[2]

Yet in spite of this widely conceived idea of 'succession,' the successions that really matter are after all to Eusebius, as to Irenaeus or Tertullian or Origen, the successions of the bishops from the apostles. It is the successions in the principal sees which form the framework of both his great historical undertakings, the *Church History* and the *Chronicle*.

The *Church History* as we have it divides itself, according to the clearly expressed intention of the author, into two main parts, the history of earlier times and the history of the author's time. The former reaches 'from the birth of our Saviour down to the destruction of the churches'—that is, to Diocletian's Edict of 303—and occupies the first seven books: at the end of the seventh book it is summarized as 'the subject of the successions' *τὴν τῶν διαδοχῶν ὑπόθεσιν*, and again at the beginning of the eighth book as 'the succession from the apostles,' in contradistinction to the account of the great persecution which follows. That these successions are the successions of the bishops in the apostolic sees is put beyond doubt by the opening words of the first book, where, though the *ὑπόθεσις* of

[1] By analogy with these passages we can see that when Eusebius in v. 20. 1 writes that Irenaeus *τὴν πρώτην τῶν ἀποστόλων κατειληφέναι διαδοχήν*, he means that in Polycarp (and perhaps in other cases as well) Irenaeus had known an immediate successor of the apostles.

[2] *H.E.* v. 11. 2, 5. For Clement's idea of a succession of teachers see further in the first Essay of this book, p. 49.

the *History* is defined at much greater length and under several heads, the place of honour is reserved for 'the successions from the holy apostles, together with the chronology of the period after Christ.' This is the first element in all that he 'planned to commit to paper': he 'would be well content if he could preserve the successions, if not from all, at any rate from the most prominent of the apostles of our Saviour as still on record in the greater churches.'

The 'greater churches' which the historian had selected as those of primary importance for his purpose were the churches of Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem. Both in the *Church History* and in the *Chronicle*[1] the successions of bishops in these four sees are recorded one after another at the appropriate points. In the *Chronicle* they constitute actually a clear majority of the notices relating to Christianity from the time of the first appointments after the apostles down to the outbreak of the great persecution. In the *History* they do not, by the nature of things, represent in bulk so large a proportion of the whole material: but on the other hand, whereas in the annalistic language of the *Chronicle* the phraseology tends to fall into a stereotyped brevity—'Romanae ecclesiae episcopatum suscipit ...' 'Antiochiae ... episcopus ordinatur' 'Alexandrinae ecclesiae ... episcopus praefuit,'—the author is careful in the *History* to reinforce the emphasis indicated in its opening paragraphs by repeated employment of 'succession' language now in one form now in another. Simplest of all these is of course the construction of

[1] The *Chronicle* is not extant in the original Greek: but we have a Latin version made by St Jerome between 378 and 381, and preserved in a number of good and early MSS.—including one at the Bodleian of the later fifth century—and this version is in the main a faithful representation of the original. The Armenian version (a much less accurate production), two Syriac epitomes, and the numerous fragments of the *Chronicle* that later Greek chroniclers, such as Syncellus (about A.D. 800), borrow from Eusebius, serve as supplementary sources of information.

διαδέχεσθαι 'to succeed' with the accusative of the person succeeded: 'Annianus dies, and Abilius succeeds him as second' (iii. 14); 'Clement succeeds Anencletus who had been bishop for twelve years' (iii. 15). But also the abstract nouns ἐπισκοπή, λειτουργία, προστασία, θρόνος, are used in the accusative governed by the same verb: 'Justus succeeds to the throne[1] of the episcopate at Jerusalem' (iii. 35); at Rome, after the martyr Fabian, 'Cornelius succeeds to the episcopate' (vi. 39. 1); 'Eumenes succeeds in the sixth place to the presidency of the church of the Alexandrines' (iv. 5. 5); after the deposition of Paul 'Domnus succeeded to the ministry of the church at Antioch' (vii. 30. 18). And besides the verb, the nouns διάδοχος and διαδοχή are quite freely employed. Alexander, bishop of the Romans, after ten years' administration dies in the third year of Hadrian, and 'Xystus was successor to him' (ἦν τούτῳ διάδοχος, iv. 4): more commonly with a genitive absolute indicating the predecessor's name and decease, 'after Victor had during ten years presided over the ministry, Zephyrinus is appointed his successor' (v. 28. 7, cf. vi. 39. 3, vii. 2, vii. 14). The usage of διαδοχή is more complicated. 'To take up the succession' is only a formal turn of the phrase 'to succeed': at Alexandria after Celadion 'Agrippinus takes up the succession' (iv. 19). But we find also a more technical use with the ordinal numbers in which the word means 'a place in the succession-line,' 'a unit in the succession': Alexander 'receives the episcopate at Rome, holding the fifth place in the succession from Peter and Paul' (πέμπτην...κατάγων διαδοχήν, iv. 1), Narcissus at Jerusalem occupied 'the fifteenth place in the line

[1] It is almost exclusively in reference to Jerusalem that Eusebius uses the term θρόνος: and the reason no doubt is that the actual 'throne' of St James was, according to the local legend, preserved there, *H. E.* vii. 19. He knows nothing of the early Roman legend of the 'cathedra Petri.'

dating from the siege under Hadrian' (v. 12. 1). Even the cardinal numbers can be by exception used in a similar connexion: at Jerusalem down to the same siege under Hadrian there were 'fifteen successions,' i.e., fifteen bishops in succession to one another (*πεντεκαίδεκα τὸν ἀριθμὸν...ἐπισκόπων διαδοχαί*, iv. 5. 2).

There is nothing, let it be repeated, unique in the use of succession language in itself as applied to the Christian episcopate. Other people besides bishops are said to 'succeed' one another, in particular emperors and the heads of philosophical or catechetical schools. At the same time in no other direction than the episcopate is the phraseology of succession employed with so much regularity and so much variety of developement: and, what is more important still, on no other occasions is the succession traced back constantly to a fixed starting-point and with careful insistence on the number of steps intervening between the starting-point and each fresh name. It did not much matter to Eusebius or his contemporaries who was reckoned first emperor, or who started the line of a catechetical school: it did very much matter that the episcopal successions of Rome or Alexandria, Antioch or Jerusalem, could be traced back to the authority of the apostles of Christ and to the first generation of the disciples. Even at Jerusalem, where the siege under Hadrian and consequent substitution of a Gentile Christian for a Jewish Christian church did effect in some sense a real break—so that, as we have seen, bishop Narcissus is reckoned as the fifteenth in succession after the siege, *ἀπὸ τῆς...πολιορκίας*—the longer reckoning is retained side by side with the other, and Narcissus himself, if he is 'fifteenth from the siege,' is also 'thirtieth from the apostles according to the continuous succession' *ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων κατὰ τὴν τῶν ἑξῆς διαδοχήν* (v. 12. 2).

It was suggested above (p. 120) that Hegesippus

attributed the ordination of St James as first bishop of Jerusalem to our Lord Himself; and an echo of this language is found in Eusebius, when in one place (vii. 19) he speaks of James as having 'received the oversight of the church of Jerusalem at the hands of the Saviour and the apostles.' But the historian's normal use is to reckon the Jerusalem line back to 'the apostles' and to speak of James as ordained by the apostles[1]: ii. 23. 1 'James the brother of the Lord, to whom was entrusted by the apostles the throne of the episcopate at Jerusalem'; *Chronicle*, Ann. Abr. 2048 = Tiberius 19, 'Ecclesiae Hierusolymarum primus episcopus ab apostolis ordinatur Iacobus frater Domini.' And consequently the episcopal succession is traced back to the same starting-point: iv. 5. 4 'this was the number of the bishops at Jerusalem from the apostles down to' the second siege.

According to the traditions accepted by Eusebius, the line of bishops was derived at Rome from the apostles Peter and Paul, at Alexandria from St Mark, at Antioch from St Peter. In each case the historian is careful, as a historian, to note at the head of the line the name of the particular apostle or disciple to whom the first ordination was due, but for subsequent appointments he prefers to number the individual bishops not from Peter or Mark but 'from the apostles.' The authority of all was involved in the action of one, and the action of one was only effective in so far as it represented and carried with it the consent of all.

Thus at Alexandria Annianus succeeds 'first after Mark the evangelist' (ii. 24; and in the *Chronicle*, Ann. Abr. 2078 = Nero 8, 'post Marcum evangelistam primus...ordinatur episcopus Annianus'): but Primus the fourth bishop is reckoned as fourth 'from the

[1] Very possibly following in this Clement of Alexandria, whom he quotes (*H.E.* ii. 1. 3) as saying in the sixth book of the *Hypotyposes* that Peter, James, and John 'selected James the Just as bishop of Jerusalem.'

apostles' (iv. 1). So too at Antioch Ignatius is 'second in the Petrine succession at Antioch,' τῆς κατ' Ἀντιόχειαν Πέτρου διαδοχῆς δεύτερος (iii. 36. 2 : cf. the *Chronicle*, Ann. Abr. 2058 = Claudius 2, 'Petrus apostolus cum primus Antiochenam ecclesiam fundasset'), whereas Theophilus is sixth, Maximin seventh, and Serapion eighth, 'from the apostles' (iv. 20, 24, v. 22). At Rome the authoritative origin of the local succession was more tenaciously enforced than elsewhere, and perhaps this is reflected in Eusebius, who on three occasions in the *History* names St Peter and St Paul as the source of the Roman line before he reverts to his usual phraseology of 'the apostles' : iii. 2 'Linus is first, after the martyrdom of Paul and Peter, to receive the episcopate of the Roman church,' iii. 21 'Clement occupied the third place of those who were bishops at Rome after Paul and Peter,'[1] iv. 1 'Alexander ranked as fifth in succession from Peter and Paul.' Not till we come to Telesphorus and Eleutherus are we told that they were respectively seventh and twelfth in succession 'from the apostles' (iv. 5. 5, v. praef. 1). For Rome, as for Alexandria, the *Chronicle*, while it carefully notes the number of each bishop in the line of succession, gives no indication of the origin of the line save on the mention of the first bishop : Ann. Abr. 2084 = Nero 14, 'Post Petrum primus Romanam ecclesiam tenuit Linus.' Here if the Latin stood alone in omitting the name of St Paul, we might have been tempted to attribute the omission to Jerome's Roman presuppositions, since Roman opinion of his day was tending more and more, as the succession there came to be looked upon as rather papal than episcopal, to exclude any other than St Peter from direct relation to it. But Jerome's evidence is reinforced by the Armenian and Syriac texts and by the chronographer Syncellus; and in face of the concurrence of all these

[1] Note that on these two occasions St Paul is named before St Peter.

independent authorities we can only conclude that the phraseology is that of Eusebius himself[1].

One other point may detain us for a moment before we pass from this review of the historian's attitude towards Apostolic Succession. It will have been noticed that in each one of the four churches the series of successive bishops is so far distinguished from the apostolic founder or founders of the line that the latter are not reckoned in as a constituent part of it: thus Linus is 'first after Paul and Peter,' Annianus is 'first after Mark,' Ignatius is 'second' (so that Euodius must be first) 'of the Antiochene succession from Peter,' James the Just must be the first, since Narcissus is thirtieth, 'from the apostles' at Jerusalem. In whatever sense the bishops are successors of the apostles, the office of the apostles is not identified with the office of their successors: Peter and Paul were not, in the conception of Eusebius, exactly bishops of Rome—though no doubt the converse is true also, and Linus was not simply 'first bishop' of Rome but 'first bishop after Peter and Paul.' Eusebius is in all this a faithful exponent of the ideas of his predecessor, Irenaeus, as they are contained in the passage quoted above on p. 123: Clement came 'in the third place from the apostles,' Xystus was 'sixth from the apostles,' Eleutherus 'in the twelfth place from the apostles.' Neither in Irenaeus nor in Eusebius are the apostles counted as units in the episcopal list[2].

But the actual identification of the apostolate and the episcopate, if it is not as old as St Irenaeus, is at any rate older than Eusebius, for it is found quite uncompromisingly expressed in St Cyprian. Writing to certain Spanish churches in support of the rights of the Christian laity, he reminds them that the

[1] In *H.E.* iii. 4. 8 he has πρῶτος μετὰ Πέτρον of Linus.

[2] So too Victor, the successor of Eleutherus, is 'thirteenth from Peter' in the writer (Hippolytus?) cited in Eus. *H.E.* v. 28. 3.

ordination of Matthias as 'bishop' in place of Judas was carried out in the presence of the whole people, in accordance with the precedents of the Old Testament, and as an example for all subsequent Christian times. Or again he has to encourage a bishop who had suffered from the rudeness of one of his deacons: deacons must remember, he says, that 'apostles, that is to say, bishops and prelates,' were chosen by our Lord himself, but deacons after the Ascension were appointed by the apostles to serve themselves and the Church. And if bishops can rebel against God who makes bishops, then and then only may deacons rebel against the bishops who appoint them[1].

Theologians who in this way identify the apostolic and episcopal office would naturally not draw even so much distinction as Eusebius and Irenaeus drew between the apostles and the bishops who came after them in the line of succession. They would count in the apostolic founder as the first bishop of the see, and Linus at Rome, Annianus at Alexandria, Euodius at Antioch, would no longer be reckoned as the first, but as the second bishop of the line[2]. This usage never superseded in the East the older method, though even there it appears sporadically; when the church historian Socrates calls Ignatius 'third bishop of Antioch from the apostle Peter' (*H.E.* vi. 8), he must have constructed his list 'Peter, Euodius, Ignatius,' and so on[3]. In the West on the other hand, from the fourth

[1] *Ep.* lxvii. 4 (Hartel 738, 17) 'de ordinando in locum Iudae episcopo Petrus ad plebem loquitur'—of course the identification is helped out by Acts i. 20 'his bishopric let another take': *ep.* iii. 3 (Hartel 471, 16) 'apostolos id est episcopos et praepositos Dominus elegit': see archbishop Benson, *Cyprian*, p. 34. Cf. Ambrosiaster *Quaest.* xcvii. 20 'nemo ignorat episcopos Salvatorem ecclesiis instituisse; ipse enim...inponens manum apostolis ordinavit eos episcopos.'

[2] Passages illustrating this point are collected more fully in my *Ecclesiae Occidentalis Monumenta Iuris Antiquissima*, i. 247.

[3] The ninth-century Greek chronographers all include St Peter in the Roman list. But the Paschal Chronicler follows the older rule.

century onwards, this method of calculation became almost *de rigueur* in reference to the church of Rome; possibly it was not unconnected with the tendency to suppress the name of St Paul as joint founder of the episcopal line, for it is always St Peter only, not St Peter and St Paul, who is reckoned in as the first unit of the succession. Jerome in the *de viris illustribus* (A.D. 392), Optatus (and following him Augustine) in Africa, and the Liberian chronographer of the year 354, repeat in different language the common theme: 'post ascensum eius beatissimus Petrus episcopatum suscepit...ann. XXV m. I d. VIII'; 'in urbe Roma Petro primo cathedram episcopalem esse conlatam...sedit prior Petrus, cui successit Linus'; 'Simon Petrus...post episcopatum Antiochensis ecclesiae...secundo Claudii anno...Romam pergit ibique viginti quinque annis cathedram sacerdotalem tenuit usque ad ultimum annum Neronis.'[1] And it is a question whether St Cyprian himself was not already adopting this system when he spoke of Hyginus as ninth bishop of Rome[2].

[1] Jerome has drawn, in this notice in the *de viris*, on his own version of the *Chronicle*, Ann. Abr. 2058=Claudius 2: 'Petrus apostolus cum primus Antiochenam ecclesiam fundasset Romam mittitur, ubi evangelium praedicans XXV annis eiusdem urbis episcopus perseverat.' However much of the rest of this notice is genuine Eusebius, the word episcopus is certainly Jerome's addition. For Optatus and St Augustine see pp. 204, 206.

[2] *Ep.* lxxiv. 2 (Hartel 801, 5) 'Marcion...cuius magister Cerdon sub Hygino episcopo, qui in Urbe nonus fuit, Romam venit': cf. Iren. *Haer.* I. xxvii. 1 Κέρδων...ἐπιδημήσας ἐνὶ τῇ Ῥώμῃ ἐπὶ Ὑγίνου ἔνατον κλῆρον...ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων ἔχοντος, III. iv. 3 Κέρδων ὁ πρὸ Μαρκίωνος καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπὶ Ὑγίνου, ὃς ἦν ἔνατος ἐπίσκοπος, εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἐλθών—the Greek of both these passages is preserved in Eus. *H.E.* iv. 11, but the Latin Irenaeus gives 'nonus' in the first passage only, 'octavus' in the second: and it is probable that 'octavus' in both cases was what Irenaeus meant. It looks as though Cyprian was here depending on Irenaeus: if so, he may have found ἔνατος (or 'nonus') already in his copy of Irenaeus, or he may have consciously altered the order by his own reckoning. In that case it seems more likely, in view of the passages quoted on p. 141, that Hyginus became ninth (instead of eighth) because St Peter is counted in, than because the second bishop Cletus-Anencletus had been already duplicated into two persons.

B.

THE PROBLEM OF NON-CATHOLIC ORDERS

I

'"One flock and one Shepherd." But if the flock is "one," how can he be numbered with that flock who is not in the number of the flock? and how can he be reckoned a shepherd who, when there is already a real shepherd in the order of the succession presiding in the church of God, opens a new succession beginning from himself?'

So St Cyprian phrased his summary objection to the claim of Novatian[1]: and it is not likely that any of his contemporaries would have differed from him in this application of the doctrine of Apostolic Succession to the case of a schismatic episcopate, since the original idea of the Succession meant, as we have seen, succession to a particular chair, to the bishopric of a particular church, and not simply to the possession of episcopal Orders. But the question whether the Apostolic Succession can be transmitted outside the Catholic Church cannot in the last resort be treated in isolation from the broader question of the relation of the Sacraments to the Church generally. Can the sacramental gifts by which under the Christian dispensation the divine life is imparted to men be validly (however irregularly and improperly) ministered apart from the unity of the Body of Christ?

This question, like all other questions of theory, was not consciously formulated till the pressure of

[1] Cypr. *ep.* lxix. 5, quoted on p. 202. Cf. *de eccl. unit.* 10.

circumstances compelled churchmen to try to think out the answer. The time came when they found themselves in face of difficulties that had actually arisen; and however much they trusted at first to instinctive or traditional ways of dealing with these difficulties, it was ultimately necessary to cross-examine their traditions and their instincts, and to evolve a policy which could be defended on the ground of Christian and Catholic principle.

But this proved to be no easy thing. Theologians answered the question from very different points of view. In the two great African bishops, St Cyprian and St Augustine, we are fortunate to have represented for us the statement and argument of the answer in its two extremest forms: and it will be well to have those clearly before us in outline at the start of our enquiry.

No, said St Cyprian: the Spirit is given to the Church, and without the grace of the Spirit the Sacraments are nothing. The sacrament of initiation into God's covenant of redemption is meaningless except as an initiation into the Church in which the purpose of redemption is worked out. And if Baptism without the Church is null, the other sacraments, which presuppose Baptism, are necessarily null also. Those who have received them have received nothing: if they are converted to the Church, they must begin by receiving what is not a second Baptism but a first.

Yes, said St Augustine: the Sacraments derive their reality not from the minister, who is nothing except an agent, but from Christ as the only source of grace and power, and His power is the same everywhere. Neither error of life nor error of faith can fetter the fulfilment of Christ's promises: and therefore, though the sacraments be administered by wicked men within, or by heretics and schismatics without, they are in either case really and completely administered. It is the disposition of the recipient that matters: where his

disposition is wrong, they are received incompletely. To be outside the Church is to be in a state of disobedience to God's Will, and the grace of a Sacrament, to anyone who is consciously outside, will only come when his disobedience is at an end. But the Sacrament was there all the same, and cannot be repeated. And the argument holds good for all sacraments, and not for Baptism only: let it be that a man has received holy Orders at the hands of schismatics or heretics, still his Orders are real, and he can no more be given another ordination than another baptism.

These are the two extreme positions. On the whole, it is true to say that the movement of Christian thought during the third and fourth centuries was a movement away from the Cyprianic point of view and in the direction of the Augustinian. It is true also to say that it is difficult, perhaps impossible, to find logical standing ground anywhere between the one position and the other; and this difficulty or impossibility did in the end, under the influence of later scholastic thinkers and especially of St Thomas, bring the Western Church to accept the whole Augustinian doctrine and its consequences. But to suppose that the theology of St Cyprian on this subject was at any time during the patristic period definitely or completely rejected by the Church in favour of the theology of St Augustine would be a misconception. No doubt the Cyprianic position upon the sacrament of Baptism was given up, after the outbreak of the Donatist controversy, even by the Catholics of Africa; the baptism not only of schismatics but of heretics was by all Western Catholics admitted thenceforward without question[1]. But the Easterns did not go the whole way even as to Baptism: while as regards holy Orders there is an almost unanimous tradition during the

[1] Yet in regard to Arians a doubt was raised in Spain as late as A.D. 385: see below p. 167, n. 1.

third, fourth and fifth centuries, in the West as much as in the East, against anything like a total assimilation of the theory that we find in St Augustine.

It is the object of the remaining portion of this essay to trace in outline the facts of the developement during the centuries just named. If the presentation of the evidence as here given is at all correct, we shall see to how large an extent modern writers, starting from the Augustinian theory as for them the traditional doctrine of the Church, have succeeded in reading it back into documents which when properly investigated yield a quite different result. Nay, even St Augustine himself, though no doubt he held that holy Orders could be validly propagated through schismatical or heretical ordinations, did not, as far as one can see, reckon such Orders as technically in the Apostolic Succession. And neither in form nor in substance is there evidence of such a view having been consciously held by any Christian thinker before him. Hardly any of his predecessors or of his contemporaries but would have rejected *in toto* the idea that Orders received in heresy or schism, at least when these had been crystallized into definite bodies, could possibly be ratified for ministry in the Catholic Church.

The pages that now follow must attempt the justification of what has been thus barely and dogmatically stated.

It was shewn in the opening sections of the present essay how, to the conception of St Irenaeus and his contemporaries, the Apostolic Succession was the peculiar and exclusive property of the Catholic Church. This Succession was a safeguard against heresy and schism, and so by its very nature it did not and could not appertain save to those who were included within the communion of the Body of Christ. Nor is there the least reason to think that any other view of the

Succession was taken in the ante-Nicene age: certainly to Eusebius the 'Apostolic Successions' are still those of the bishops who succeeded one after another in the presidency of the local communities within the Church and who continued in fellowship each with the rest. If from the beginning of the third century a tendency is traceable to make the succession somewhat more an appanage of the bishop as such, somewhat less of the bishop as bishop of a particular church, yet whatever there is worthy of remark in this new developement, it is essential to remember that nothing whatever is changed in the connotation of the Apostolic Succession: it still belongs only to bishops in communion, and because of their communion, with the Church Catholic and Apostolic.

Upon this conception of the Apostolic Succession certain conclusions appear naturally to follow as to the relation of the Sacraments, and especially of the sacrament of holy Orders, to the Church: if bishops of heretical or schismatical bodies were not in the Succession, they were presumably not true bishops at all, or to put it in technical language, the Orders which they received or conveyed were not merely irregular but invalid. And the broad principle on which this conclusion was based, that the gifts of Christ and His Spirit are given to His Body, would naturally be applicable not to one sacrament only but to all. There is, so to say, a certain solidarity of the Sacraments. It is not at first sight easy to assert that holy Orders belong exclusively to the visible communion of the Church, but that Baptism can be really administered outside it. Nor when once we recognize to the full how overmastering was the sense of order which dominated the mind of the primitive Church[1], can we

[1] On this point reference may be made to the writer's chapter on 'The Organisation of the Church,' in the *Cambridge Medieval History*, vol. i. (1911), p. 156.

conceive that it would have seemed possible to think that the sacrament of initiation into the company of Christ's disciples, the Spirit-bearing Body, was effectually ministered when a convert from paganism was admitted into this or that Gnostic sect.

We may be sure, then, that a Valentinian or a Marcionite of the second century, desiring to be received into the Church, would have been baptized, and his former baptism (if any) would have been treated as null. And so long as the main controversy with heresy or schism was with men so far removed from the fundamental doctrines of Christianity as the Gnostics, it is not likely that any difficulty was felt in placing on the same level all sacraments external to the Church, and rejecting them *en masse*. Indeed the whole dispute about the rebaptism of schismatics in the third century is only intelligible on the supposition that the heretics of earlier times had been in fact rebaptized[1]: for if otherwise, there could have been no effective answer to the argument *a fortiori* from the reception of heretics to the reception of schismatics.

Therefore, doubtful as many points in our enquiry must be, it is hardly doubtful that in the age of St Irenaeus the Sacraments were regarded as, one and all, the exclusive heritage of the Church. That does not mean that any theology of the relation of the Sacraments to the Church had been worked out or formulated: it was simply the instinctive way of dealing with the problem so far as it had yet arisen. But as the second century passed into the third, the practical question became pressing and soon urgent. Heresies multiplied, and different forms of thought shaded off by imperceptible degrees from the central theology of

[1] It is inevitable to use the word rebaptize: but of course it was common ground to all parties that baptism could not be repeated, and whenever the rite was administered, it was on the ground that anything which had gone before was not true Christian baptism at all.

the Church in the direction of Monarchianism or Subordinationism. Disciplinary difficulties, when the Church by expansion came into necessary contact with the world, grew more and more acute, and hardened into schisms—permanent, like that of the Montanists, or temporary, like that of Hippolytus at Rome—as the Puritan temper revolted against accommodations and renounced communion with those who conceded them. But it was the later persecutions, those of Decius and Diocletian, which left behind them in this respect the most fatal legacy: the disasters inflicted directly by the State were as nothing compared with the disorder that arose out of the attempts to repair them. Novatian—like Hippolytus a generation earlier, at once the most accomplished theologian and the most rigid disciplinarian of his day at Rome—held that to those who had apostatized under Decius no restoration of communion was possible, even at the imminent approach of death: the *lapsi*, though they might, if truly repentant, trust in the mercies of God which go beyond His covenant, could never recover their Christian status. Not only so, but, since the Church must be holy as well as catholic and apostolic, those who did receive them to communion had by the very act of receiving them incurred the same penalty. On the same lines the Donatists of Africa maintained that all bishops who had handed over to the officials of the government, in the persecution of Diocletian, the sacred vessels or the sacred books, had ceased *ipso facto* to be bishops, and the sacraments administered by them were no longer of effect, so that their flocks had no choice but to renounce communion with them and to procure for themselves other bishops. Bishops ordained by these *traditores*—and Caecilian of Carthage, they alleged, had been so ordained—were also no bishops at all, nor were any who, in spite of the defect of their consecration, communicated with them. As all the

churches of Europe and Asia ended by recognizing Caecilian, it followed that on the strict Donatist view the Catholic Church had dwindled down to the faithful of Africa.

Thus altar was set up against altar, and Christian fellowship was refused by those who, divided from one another on some point of discipline, adhered to the same Creed and accepted the same Scriptures and aspired to the grace of the same Sacraments[1]. When these schisms first came into being, those who adhered to them had of course been baptized and (if they were clerics) ordained within the bosom of the Church, and no doubt could arise as to the full reality and validity of the Baptism and the Orders that they had received; so that if they returned to the Church there could never be any idea of reiterating the one or the other. But so soon as separation was an accomplished thing, all sacraments thenceforward administered were administered in schism: converts from paganism baptized, or lay converts from the Church ordained, under the new circumstances—if these asked for admission to the Church, was the layman to be rebaptized and the clergyman (supposing he were allowed to perform clerical functions) to be reordained? It was inevitable, now that it was no longer a matter of antithesis between the Church and anti-Christian heresy, that there should be many searchings of heart over the extension to such cases of the old rigid policy. In particular the question would be asked whether at least the sacrament of Baptism might not have been effectually given to the Gentile convert, if duly administered with the right form and in the right faith, even though outside the only true Church. The greater the emphasis laid on the necessity for Baptism as the sole gate of entrance

[1] Cf. Cyprian, *ep.* lxix. 7 'eandem legem tenere quam catholica ecclesia teneat, eodem symbolo quo et nos baptizare, eundem nosse Deum patrem, eundem filium Christum, eundem Spiritum sanctum.'

into God's covenant of redemption, the more insistent would be the charitable wish to include within the ranks of the baptized those who, while sharing in the common Christian confession, had received the rite, it may be through no conscious fault of their own[1], from Montanists or Novatianists or Donatists—or even perhaps in those less organized schisms which emerged from time to time as the result of personal differences between members of the same local church, and disappeared as quickly as they had come[2].

In the course of the third century such questions came to be asked over an ever-widening ground. In the case of Baptism, the claim for its recognition was extended step by step to one class of separatists after another. But the process was very much slower in the case of holy Orders. There is no sign that before St Augustine any theologian had worked out the theory, or any church had adopted the practice, of the general recognition of Orders conferred outside the Catholic Church. And our task in the following pages will largely consist of shewing the different attitude adopted by the same writer or by the same community in regard to the one sacrament and to the other.

There is no trace either in Clement of Alexandria or in Tertullian of any advance beyond the position of Irenaeus. To both of them 'heretics' still means

[1] Cf. St Augustine, *de baptismo* i. 2(3).

[2] Thus St Basil in his first canonical letter to Amphilochius (*ep.* 188 of the continuous series: Migne, *P. G.* xxxii. 664; Beveridge, Συνοδικόν, ii. 47), can. 1, distinguishes three kinds of separatists as to whom the question of validity of their Sacraments might arise, with the possibility of different answers for each kind: that of heretics, who have entirely broken away and are alien from us in the essence of our faith; that of schismatics, who have separated themselves over ecclesiastical matters or questions of discipline that were not vital; and finally that of what he calls παρασυναγωγαί, rival congregations formed by insubordinate bishops or priests, and by ignorant laymen, where for instance some cleric has been deposed for his irregularities but has refused to recognize the sentence of deposition and goes on ministering outside the Church.

Gnostics, and they have no doubt that heretical baptism is no real baptism at all. Thus Clement interprets the ὕδωρ ἀλλότριον of Prov. ix. 18 *b* (LXX) as heretical baptism in contrast to the 'genuine water' of the Church[1]. To Tertullian there is one Baptism, just as there is one Lord, and one God and Father: and since the heretics have neither the same God nor the same Lord with us, it follows that they cannot share the same baptism. But if their baptism is not the same, it is nothing: therefore when they come to us they are baptized with what is not a second baptism but a first[2].

So too in Asia Minor it was assumed that the baptism of heretics, whose God and Christ were not those of the Christian Church, was no baptism. But when the Montanist schism arose, it was not clear that the rejection of the baptism of Gnostic heretics necessarily carried with it the rejection of the baptism of those who, whatever their errors, confessed the same Father and the same Son as the Catholics. To examine these scruples a large number of bishops met together in Iconium, and the custom was upheld of recognizing

[1] *Strom.* I. 19 τὸ βάπτισμα τὸ αἱρετικὸν οὐκ οἰκεῖον καὶ γνήσιον ὕδωρ λογιζομένη.

[2] *De bapt.* 15 'Unus omnino baptismus est nobis, tam ex Domini evangelio quam ex Apostoli litteris, quoniam "unus Deus" et "unum baptisma" et una ecclesia in caelis. sed circa haereticos sane quid custodiendum sit digne quis retractet. ad nos enim editum est: haeretici autem nullum habent consortium nostrae disciplinae, quos extraneos utique testatur ipsa ademptio communicationis. non debeo in illis cognoscere quod mihi est praeceptum, quia non idem Deus est nobis et illis, nec unus Christus, id est idem, ideoque nec baptismus unus, quia non idem: quem cum rite non habeant, sine dubio non habent, nec capit numerari quod non habetur. ita nec possunt accipere, quia non habent. sed de isto plenius iam nobis in graeco digestum est. semel ergo lavacrum inimus, semel delicta diluuntur, quia ea iterari non oportet.' Tertullian's Greek treatise on baptism is, of course, lost. [Abp. Benson, *Cyprian*, p. 339, interprets 'ad nos editum est' as a reference to the Carthaginian council under Agrippinus (on which see below): but the words are parallel to the following 'mihi est praeceptum,' and the emphasis is on *nos*, *mihi*. The command to baptize was given to us, the Church.]

no baptism whatever that had been conferred outside the Church[1]. And Dionysius of Alexandria, citing particularly this synod of Iconium and another at the neighbouring Synnada, uses language which suggests that he regarded this, for the East at any rate, as the prevalent and traditional view[2].

In the West the problem was first definitely mooted, so far as we can judge, at an African council, which was presided over by Agrippinus of Carthage and attended by numerous bishops of the two provinces of proconsular Africa and Numidia[3]. Very probably the occasion may have been the same as in Asia Minor, namely the appearance in Africa of the Montanist movement. The more rigid view was here too upheld: and in the light of Tertullian's language, it must be supposed that the rigid view was also the traditional view. If St Cyprian emphasizes the superior value of truth over custom, that is not because he admitted that his own practice was not traditional in Africa[4], but because a Roman

[1] Firmilian ap. Cypr. *ep.* lxxv. § 19 [A.D. 256] 'ab initio hoc tenentes quod a Christo et ab apostolis traditum est. nec meminimus hoc apud nos aliquando coepisse, cum semper sic istic [istic = 'here'] observatum sit ut nonnisi unam Dei ecclesiam nossemus et sanctum baptisma nonnisi sanctae ecclesiae conputaremus. plane quoniam quidam de eorum baptismo dubitabant qui, etsi novos prophetas recipiunt, eosdem tamen patrem et filium nosse nobiscum videntur, plurimi simul convenientes in Iconio diligentissime tractavimus, et confirmavimus repudiandum esse omne omnino baptisma quod sit extra ecclesiam constitutum.' In § 7 Firmilian refers to this council as held 'iam pridem': yet if the first person plural is rightly understood to imply that he himself took part in the council, it can hardly have been held before about A.D. 225.

[2] Dion. Al. ap. Eus. *H. E.* vii. 5. 5 *ὄντως γὰρ δόγματα περὶ τούτου γέγονεν ἐν ταῖς μεγίσταις τῶν ἐπισκόπων συνόδοις, ὡς πυνθάνομαι, ὥστε τοὺς προσιόντας ἀπὸ αἱρέσεων προκατηχηθέντας εἶτα ἀπολούεσθαι καὶ ἀνακαθαίρεσθαι τὸν τῆς παλαιᾶς καὶ ἀκαθάρτου ζύμης ῥύπον*: vii. 7. 5 *πρὸ πολλοῦ κατὰ τοὺς πρὸ ἡμῶν ἐπισκόπους ἐν ταῖς πολυανθρωποτάταις ἐκκλησίαις καὶ ταῖς συνόδοις τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἐν Ἰκονίῳ καὶ Συνάδοις καὶ παρὰ πολλοῖς τοῦτο ἔδοξεν.*

[3] Cypr. *epp.* lxxi. 4, lxxiii. 3: as for the date, 'anni iam multi et longa aetas' had elapsed, which may take us back to 210—220 A.D.

[4] It is true that both St Augustine (*de bapt.* ii. 12 etc.) and St Vincent of Lerins (*Commonitorium* 6) say that Agrippinus introduced a *new* custom

tradition had been set up against the African tradition; and the church of Rome being undoubtedly more ancient than the church of Carthage, the argument from African tradition obviously needed reinforcement from some other quarter.

But what of this Roman tradition? There is no doubt that, when controversy on the subject became acute in the sixth decade of the third century, the Roman official view was that the refusal to rebaptize was the inherited custom of the Roman church. 'Nihil innovetur nisi quod traditum est,' wrote pope Stephen: and the author of the *de Rebaptismate* was quite sure that tradition and custom were all on one side, that Rebaptism was an innovation, and that those who introduced it were unnecessarily troubling peace[1]. We must give due weight to this evidence: but we must at the same time remember that Roman churchmen, when writing on topics of controversy, have been, since controversies began, somewhat over-ready to claim an immemorial prescription and apostolic authority for the practice of the Roman church. And there are some definite indications that tell in the other direction. Novatian would hardly have rebaptized converts who joined him, if he had been brought up in surroundings

of rebaptism. But I doubt if either of them had any historical authority for this: I think they depended only on their own presumption of superior antiquity for the general practice, and on St Cyprian's apparent attack on custom.

[1] *De Rebapt.* 1 'vetustissima consuetudine ac traditione ecclesiastica,' 'contra priscam et memorabilem cunctorum emeritorum sanctorum et fidelium solemnissimam observationem': the aim of the leader on the other side was to acquire reputation for having set right 'errores et vitia universarum ecclesiarum': *ib.* 15 'custodita tanti temporis tot virorum veneranda nobis consuetudine et auctoritate.' This treatise, though apparently directed against Cyprian in person, has survived, oddly enough, among the pseudo-Cyprianic writings. On the author's conception of Baptism and Confirmation, see below, p. 165. [Abp. Benson, *Cyprian*, p. 394, will not allow him to have been an Italian because of his silence about papal claims: but his Bible text is not, it would seem, African, and I believe him to have been a Roman.]

exclusively dominated by the opposite practice. There is in fact a phrase dropped in Hippolytus' *Philosophumena* which serves to show that the question was in dispute, not more than a generation earlier, within the bosom of the Roman church: last among the counts of the indictment which Hippolytus preferred on matters both of theology and of discipline against Callistus, bishop of Rome about 217—222, is the charge that 'first in this man's time they had the audacity to introduce second baptism,' *ἐπὶ τούτου πρώτως τετόλμηται δεύτερον αὐτοῖς βάπτισμα.* What exactly it was that Callistus or his friends and contemporaries had introduced, to the displeasure of Hippolytus, is not made clear; but at any rate in one form or another the question was being raised about 220 A.D., and a policy was being introduced on one side which was criticized from the other side as an innovation[1].

To sum up the condition of things at the outbreak of the Rebaptism controversy about A.D. 255, the main heads of the developement down to that date are two: the one, that in the second century the issue was confined to the case of heresy—and that in the extreme form of Gnosticism—so that it is likely that the rejection of non-catholic baptism was actually universal; the other, that as the third century progressed cases of schism began to supersede in numbers and importance what

[1] We know of course that Hippolytus stood for the rigid, and Callistus for the laxer, conception of discipline: we should so far have guessed that Callistus had anticipated Stephen's position and Hippolytus Novatian's. And short as Roman memories could be when convenient, it is difficult to suppose that even Stephen could have appealed to tradition if a pope had taken the opposite line to himself only thirty-five years earlier. Yet for myself I incline to think that what Callistus (or rather his underlings: Hippolytus only says *ἐπὶ τούτου*) did was to *rebaptize adherents of Hippolytus*, and that this was what Hippolytus resented, because it was to treat him as a bishop who was in schism, and so could not validly baptize. If this is correct, both Hippolytus and Callistus would have rebaptized converts from heresy. For a similar objection to 'second baptism' on the part of a writer who certainly held to the rebaptism of heretics see *Ap. Const.* vi. 15. 2, 4 (*ἐκ δευτέρου βαπτίζειν*), *Ap. Can.* 47.

had before been the only cases to consider. No common policy grew out of the new situation: on the contrary, the first result of forcing churchmen to examine the grounds on which, or the region within which, they regarded the sacraments, and especially the sacrament of Baptism, as possessing full reality and validity, was that three separate theories tended to crystallize in distinction from one another. It was indeed admitted on all hands that there were certain external elements in the administration of the Sacraments which were dictated by Scripture and tradition, and without which there was no certainty of the intention to perform the Church's rites—water and the baptismal formula in the sacrament of Baptism, prayer and the imposition of hands in the sacrament of Orders. It was admitted also that, whatever could be given in the sacramental gifts outside the Church, something or other remained over which could only be received within the Church. But there agreement ended.

The more conservative view, represented by Cyprian of Carthage and Firmilian of Cappadocian Caesarea, extended the ancient rejection of heretical baptism to cover all baptism whatever administered outside the Church: and this was the more easy because much of the argument for instance of St Irenaeus was transferable without more ado from the one class of cases to the other. On the same side was the whole weight of the passionate sense of order which the primitive Church shared with St Paul. The wonder is not that this theory captivated St Cyprian and his partisans, but that, at least in its extreme and most consistent form, it was so largely—in the end so universally—given up. Theory, in fact, was overcome by practice. In the affairs of life one principle is continually being crossed by another, and we have to allow for both. The discipline which had kept the world at arm's length during the second century was gradually relaxed. Montanus and Tertullian,

Hippolytus and Novatian, voiced the Puritan protest, at one point after another of the process, against what seemed to them the spirit of accommodation and compromise. But the Church at large and the statesmen-bishops who directed its action, treating the system of discipline as a means to an end, the general good, modified the ancient provisions as the circumstances of each generation seemed to require. Throughout the third century a large temper of moderation, of ἐπιείκεια, prevailed in the high places of the Church, and of this temper the great Dionysius of Alexandria is perhaps the most striking representative—a temper which shrank from extremes, from pressing any one principle to its rigid and logical conclusion without weighing the considerations that might affect and qualify it. By analogy with other developements we might have guessed that neither the rigid exclusiveness of Cyprian in the matter of Rebaptism nor the equally rigid inclusiveness of Stephen would find favour with St Dionysius.

In fact neither at Alexandria in the third century, nor in the East at large during the patristic period, do we find any sweeping generalization on one side or the other. The council of Nicaea accepted the baptism of the Novatianists and rejected that of the followers of Paul of Samosata. In full conformity with this action, St Basil puts it that the ancients determined to accept the baptism of those sects which did not differ from the Church on the subject-matter of the faith[1], that is, speaking roughly, of schismatics as opposed to heretics: and this distinction appears to have

1 *Ep. canonica ad Amphilochium* [ep. 188], § 1 ἐκεῖνο γὰρ ἔκρινον οἱ παλαιοὶ δέχεσθαι βάπτισμα τὸ μηδὲν τῆς πίστεως παρεκβαῖνον. Like all later writers, he regards the Montanists as heretics rather than mere schismatics, and rejects their baptism with that of Gnostics and Manichees. But he recognizes the absence of any fixed rule, and allows much weight to local custom.

prevailed generally in the East at that date[1]. The canon printed as the seventh canon of the council of Constantinople (A.D. 381), while it has nothing to do with that council, does give the line of demarcation as the custom of the Constantinopolitan church fixed it in the fifth century: the baptism is accepted of Arians Macedonians and Apollinarians (besides various schismatics), but not of Eunomians—that is, the extremer Arians—or Sabellians. Clearly the dividing line is no longer what it was in the time of St Athanasius and St Basil: it is no longer drawn between schism and heresy, but between some heretics and others. It has been generally thought that the idea which underlay the new classification is to distinguish sects that acknowledge a real Trinity from sects that do not: but at least an equal share in the result should probably be ascribed to the importance or unimportance of the sects concerned. Anyhow, as the case of each new separation had to be dealt with on its merits, it is obvious that this whole system of the Eastern Church leaves to each generation in turn the duty of deciding what is or what is not a valid baptism. In effect the Church can legitimize whenever it seems right to her to do so.

So far we have found two theories of the relation of Baptism to the Church: the theory that the Church *cannot* legitimize any baptism given outside the Church, and the theory that the Church *may* and ought to legitimize some baptisms so given, of which theory the corollary appears to be that she may for sufficient reason legitimize them all. The latter theory is purely Eastern, and becomes more and more the official theology of the

[1] Council of Laodicea, canons 7 and 8, admits the baptism of Novatianists, but not that of Montanists: Athanasius, *Orat. contra Arianos*, ii. 42, 43, rejects that of Arians Paulianists and Montanists, *οὐ γὰρ ὁ λέγων ἁπλῶς* κύριε [Matt. vii. 21] *οὗτος καὶ δίδωσιν, ἀλλ' ὁ μετὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος καὶ τὴν πίστιν ἔχων ὀρθήν. διὰ τοῦτο γοῦν καὶ ὁ Σωτὴρ οὐχ ἁπλῶς ἐνετείλατο βαπτίζειν ἀλλὰ πρῶτόν φησι* μαθητεύσατε...*ἵν' ἐκ τῆς μαθήσεως ἡ πίστις ὀρθὴ γένηται καὶ μετὰ πίστεως ἡ τοῦ βαπτίσματος τελείωσις προστεθῇ.*

Greek Church. The former theory ceased to prevail in any part of the Catholic West after the council of Arles, when the African Catholics sacrificed it as the price of the support given them by the other Western churches against the Donatists, and the Cyprianic tradition lived on only in sects like the Donatists and the Luciferians: but it survived in parts of the East, and is still uncompromisingly set forth in the Apostolic Constitutions and Canons in the second half of the fourth century[1]. But neither of these theologies is that with which we are ourselves familiar. Already in St Cyprian's day the Roman church had arrived at a third theory, that the Church *must* legitimize all baptisms given (with the right form and matter) in any heresy or schism whatever.

When or by whom this theory was formulated, we do not know. Neither the idea that it represents the original attitude of the Roman church[2], nor the idea that its object was to attract as many non-catholics as possible to return to the Church, accounts for it satisfactorily. Rather, we should see in it a short cut to a logically complete conclusion, starting from the premisses that in some cases rebaptism was certainly undesirable, and that it was difficult to defend any

[1] *Ap. Const.* vi. 15 ὁμοίως καὶ βαπτίσματι ἑνὶ ἀρκεῖσθαι μόνῳ...οὐ τῷ παρὰ τῶν δυσωνύμων αἱρετικῶν ἀλλὰ τῷ παρὰ τῶν ἀμέμπτων ἱερέων δεδομένῳ...μήτε τὸ παρὰ τῶν ἀσεβῶν δεκτὸν ὑμῖν ἔστω...οὔτε μὴν οἱ βαπτισθέντες ὑπ' αὐτῶν μεμύηνται ἀλλὰ μεμολυσμένοι ὑπάρχουσιν: *Ap. Can.* 46 ἐπίσκοπον ἢ πρεσβύτερον αἱρετικῶν δεξαμένους βάπτισμα ...καθαιρεῖσθαι προστάσσομεν, 47 ἐπίσκοπος ἢ πρεσβύτερος...τὸν μεμολυσμένον παρὰ τῶν ἀσεβῶν ἐὰν μὴ βαπτίσῃ, καθαιρείσθω. It is true that only heresies, not schisms, are mentioned in terms: but this is perhaps because in the East heresies occupied a larger place, schisms a smaller one, than in the West.

[2] So L. Saltet, *Les réordinations: étude sur le sacrement de l'Ordre* (Paris, 1907), pp. 12, 18, 19. A general acknowledgment must suffice for the debt which the remaining pages of this essay owe to M. Saltet's work. I have freely drawn on his material; his conclusions I do not always share, because, though he is too honest not to admit that the Roman church did not at the outset profess the full Augustinian theology on the subject of reordinations, he yet reads this theology back into times and writers where I can find no real trace of it.

rebaptism on grounds that did not in the end apply to all. It was beyond question at Rome that this result was first reached: the practical instinct of the Roman Church quickly carried the matter through both stages —the first, that Christian charity or Christian policy, whichever you like to call it, repudiated the rigid extension of the older rule of rebaptizing heretics to the newer cases of schismatics, but secondly also that this repudiation of rebaptism as necessary in every case must really involve the repudiation of rebaptism as necessary in any case. In the last resort the decision must depend on some broad and simple principle: and Roman theology found this in the power of the Name of Christ or of the Holy Trinity[1].

On the sacrament of Baptism the Roman theology thus anticipated very nearly the developed formulas of St Augustine. But whereas St Augustine extended the same principle to cover all the Sacraments, and so was able to arrive at a consistent and coherent conception of the relation of the Sacraments to the Church, the Roman opponents of St Cyprian carefully limited the application of their principle to the one sacrament only. They were statesmen not theologians, and were reluctant to deal with more than the problem that had actually arisen: moreover, so far as it was the instinct of Christian charity that had dictated their policy, that instinct was satisfied when it was conceded that Christians

[1] ap. Cypr. *ep.* lxxiii. 16 'ut dicat "in nomine Iesu Christi ubicumque et quomodocumque baptizati gratiam baptismi sunt consecuti"': *ep.* lxxv. 9 'non putant quaerendum esse quis sit ille qui baptizaverit, eo quod qui baptizatus sit gratiam consequi potuerit invocata Trinitate nominum, patris et filii et spiritus sancti': *ib.* 18 'in multum, inquit, proficit nomen Christi ad fidem et baptismi sanctificationem, ut quicumque et ubicumque in nomine Christi baptizatus fuerit consequatur statim gratiam Christi.' *de Rebapt.* 7 'invocatio nominis Iesu non debet a nobis futilis videri propter venerationem et virtutem ipsius nominis': 10 'ne invocatio nominis Iesu quae aboleri non potest contemptui a nobis videatur habita,' 'invocatione nominis Iesu perseverante, quia non potest a quoquam hominum quae semel invocata est auferri.'

outside the communion of the Church possessed, truly and validly, the sacrament primarily necessary to salvation. However much Stephen and Cyprian differed about Baptism, it was common ground to them, and it would seem not only to all their contemporaries but to their successors of the next generations for another hundred years, that no other sacrament could be validly administered in heresy or schism. The gift of the Holy Spirit, whether in Confirmation or in Ordination, was recognized on both sides as reserved to the Holy Church.

II

We need not labour the proof that where Baptism was regarded as invalid, holy Orders were *a fortiori* regarded as invalid also. If the initial sacrament had to be repeated, it was not conceivable that the sacraments which followed it and assumed it could stand; a man who was unbaptized could not have received a true gift of ordination. To any who accepted Cyprian's position there could be no question but that heretical orders fell with heretical baptism. It will suffice to cite in illustration a couple of passages where the parallel is actually drawn. 'All authority and grace,' writes Firmilian, 'is set in the Church, where the elders preside who possess authority both for baptizing and for laying on hands [confirming] and for ordaining: heretics, just as they can neither ordain nor lay on hands, so they cannot baptize.' 'Heretical baptism does not admit a man to be a member of the Christian laity, nor heretical ordination to be a member of the Christian clergy' is the rule enunciated by the fourth century author of the Apostolic Constitutions and Canons[1]. And naturally those who took, like most Easterns, a middle course

[1] Firmilian, ap. Cypr. *ep.* lxxv. 7 'haereticum enim sicut ordinare non licet nec manum inponere, ita nec baptizare nec quicquam sancte et spiritaliter gerere.' *Ap. Can.* 68 τοὺς παρὰ τοιούτων [sc. αἱρετικῶν] βαπτισθέντας ἢ χειροτονηθέντας οὔτε πιστοὺς οὔτε κληρικοὺς εἶναι.

and accepted the baptism of some while they rejected the baptism of others, would reject the orders of those at least whose baptism they rejected.

All this is very obvious: but the position which demands attention is that of those who, in the case of the same sects or persons, admitted the baptism but yet rejected the orders. For this distinction between holy Orders and holy Baptism there were two main reasons, of which the first is disciplinary and by comparison unessential, the second rests on a serious principle of ancient theology.

(*a*) The first ground of distinction resulted from the broad general rule that those who had been put to ecclesiastical penance were incapable either of being ordained, or, if already in holy Orders, of ever resuming their clerical functions[1]. But to have served as a cleric in a heretical or schismatical body was in itself a public offence, only to be purged by penance: converts from such bodies, if their baptism was recognized, were yet always admitted to the communion of the Church with

[1] Illustrations abound in St Cyprian's correspondence. Trofimus, an Italian bishop who had lapsed in the persecution, was readmitted by pope Cornelius, and the proceeding caused some scandal in Africa: Cyprian assures objectors that of course he was only admitted to lay communion, 'sic tamen admissus est Trofimus ut laicus communicet, non (secundum quod ad te malignorum litterae pertulerunt) quasi locum sacerdotii usurpet,' *ep.* lv. 11. Other cases of lapsed bishops are those of the African Fortunatianus of Assuras and the Spaniard Basilides of Leon and Astorga, who attempted to reinstate themselves in office, the latter by the help of Stephen of Rome: Cyprian (*epp.* lxv, lxvii) treats the matter as one which no circumstances could mitigate or doubts affect. And though the consequences he draws may be the reflexion of his own special theology of the Sacraments—their eucharists were invalid ('nec oblatio sanctificari illic possit ubi sanctus Spiritus non sit,' lxv. 4) and the faithful laity must procure for themselves new bishops—yet for the universal prevalence of the rule that such clergy could only be readmitted to lay communion, 'gratulans si sibi vel laico communicare contingeret,' he can appeal to the consent of the bishops throughout the world and especially of pope Cornelius, lxvii. 6 'eiusmodi homines ad paenitentiam quidem agendam posse admitti, ab ordinatione autem cleri atque sacerdotali honore prohiberi.' So too, a century later, in the East we have the 62nd Apostolic Canon, *εἴ τις κληρικὸς... ἀρνήσηται ... μετανοήσας ὡς λαϊκὸς δεχθήτω.*

the same solemn reconciliation by laying on of hands as other penitents, and, if they were bishops or clergymen, only to lay communion[1].

This is a rule of discipline, and a rule which savours of the severity of the code of primitive times. We are not surprised therefore to find that it is assumed by rigorists like St Cyprian and St Firmilian, and in the next century by the Luciferians and the Donatists[2]. But when Optatus tells us that those Donatists who did recognize Catholic baptism evaded the recognition of Catholic orders, or the possibility of the ordination of lay converts, by putting them one and all to penance, his language seems to imply that it was common ground to both sides that penitents could neither be ordained nor readmitted to clerical function: 'invenistis pueros, de paenitentia sauciastis ne aliqui ordinari potuissent... invenistis diaconos presbyteros episcopos, fecistis laicos.' And a generation later than the treatise of Optatus, pope Innocent, writing to the bishops of Macedonia in the matter of clerics ordained by Bonosus, bishop of Sardica, after he had been deposed for false teaching, restates the same principle as a fatal bar to the possibility of such persons ministering in the Church: 'ubi paenitentiae remedium necessarium est, illic ordinationis honorem locum habere non posse decernimus.'[3]

[1] Cornelius ap. Eus. *H. E.* vi. 43. 10, of one of Novatian's consecrators, *ἐπανῆλθεν εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἀποδυρόμενος καὶ ἐξομολογούμενος...ᾧ καὶ ἐκοινωνήσαμεν λαϊκῷ, ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ δεηθέντος παντὸς τοῦ παρόντος λαοῦ.*

[2] Cypr. *ep.* lxxii. 2 'si qui presbyteri aut diaconi (1) vel in ecclesia catholica prius ordinati fuerint et postmodum perfidi ac rebelles contra ecclesiam steterint, (2) vel apud haereticos a pseudoepiscopis et antichristis contra Christi dispositionem profana ordinatione promoti sint... hac conditione suscipi cum revertuntur, ut communicent laici et satis habeant quod admittuntur ad pacem.' Cf. the objector in Jerome's *Dialogus adversus Luciferianos*, 13 'laicus etiam extra ecclesiae fidem baptizatus, paenitens recipitur: episcopus vero aut paenitentiam non agit et sacerdos est, aut si paenitentiam egerit esse episcopus desinit.'

[3] Optatus, ii. 24: Innocent, *ep.* xxii. § 3, cf. § 4 'nostrae vero lex est ecclesiae, venientibus ab haereticis (qui tamen illic baptizati sint) per manus inpositionem laicam tantum tribuere communionem.'

But in fact this objection, resting as it did on a primitive system of discipline which was being gradually accommodated to the altered conditions of Church life, was bound in time to yield to the pressure of circumstances. Suppose a schism could be healed by the acceptance of the schismatic community *en masse* within the bosom of the Church—its laymen as Catholic laymen, its clergy as a Catholic clergy—the imperative call of Christian charity and Christian unity could not pass unheeded, if the difficulty in the way was a difficulty of rule only and not of principle. So St Basil speaks with respect of the οἰκονομία τῶν πολλῶν as having moved some Asiatic churches in such matters: and pope Innocent, in the letter just cited, admits that another line than his own had been taken by the local episcopate in Macedonia, 'ne fieret non mediocre scandalum'; and though he directs that his own stricter line should now be followed, he does so rather on the ground that any special need for laxity had ceased than on the ground that there could be no such need at all. 'Necessitas temporis,' 'usurpatio quam ad praesens fieri tempus impellit,' are phrases that have a new ring about them, and mark the transition into another period of Church history.

(*b*) The second objection to the recognition by the Church of any orders conferred externally to her communion went much deeper, and rested on the fundamental principle of the theology of the Sacraments as that was held almost universally, throughout the third and fourth centuries, by those who admitted the validity of some or all of the baptisms externally administered: not till the end of the fifth century did the influence of St Augustine powerfully affect, in this matter, the teaching of the Church outside Africa. However acute the controversy as to whether any or what heretical baptism could be regarded as valid, it was common ground to all parties that the gift of the

Holy Spirit could not be conferred outside the Church; and those who admitted external baptisms did so with the express reservation that Baptism stood on separate ground from other sacraments. The power of the Name of Christ was, as they held, so great that the effect of the Baptismal invocation was independent of the status of the baptizer or of his relation to the Catholic Church, but the bestowal of the Spirit did not follow until the moment of reconciliation. The imposition of hands with which the convert, if his baptism were recognized, was always and everywhere received into the Church, was regarded as identical with the imposition of hands in Confirmation[1]: it was the completion of what was incomplete without it, the perfection of the gift of Baptism by the gift of the Holy Spirit. This principle might find different modes of expression: but it was at bottom the same principle which underlay the practice whether of the Roman Church or of the Eastern Churches.

The only literary defence of the validity of heretical baptism that has come down to us from the controversies of the third century is the Latin, probably Roman, treatise *de Rebaptismate*. Of its two main arguments, the historical and the doctrinal, we have already had occasion to deal with the former[2], but it is on the latter that the author lays his real stress. The theme which he developes at length is the unimportance of baptism with water compared to baptism with the Holy Spirit, 'baptisma aquae quod minus est,' 'baptisma Spiritus quod non dubie maius est.' The less essential part of the rite could be administered outside the Church, the more essential element belonged to the Church only and was indeed what was given in the rite of reception. And to make the position quite clear, the author distinguishes summarily the three relations in

[1] St Jerome is an exception: see below p. 179.
[2] P. 154.

which the one element may stand to the other. Normally and ideally, the catechumen is baptized by 'one of ourselves' (he means by a Catholic bishop), and the seal of confirmation will follow at once, the two parts of the rite not suffering any separation from each other: but again, in case of necessity baptism may have to be administered by one of the lesser clergy, priest or deacon, and then the completion of the rite belongs, if recovery follows, to the bishop, or, if not, it is left to God: thirdly, if the baptism has been given (whether by a bishop or no) outside the Church, then things must be set right as and so far as they can be, since the Holy Spirit is not outside the Church, and therefore the convert must be received as a penitent and be restored 'with a baptism of the Spirit, in other words, with the laying on of hands by the bishop and the conferring of the gift of the Holy Ghost.'[1]

Whoever it was who wrote this tract on Rebaptism, the attitude which he adopted was the attitude also of the Roman church from pope Stephen to pope Leo. The arguments of Cyprian and Firmilian against Stephen are based throughout on the assumption that he drew a distinction between Baptism on the one side and Laying on of hands on the other. 'It is not enough,' writes Cyprian to him, 'to lay hands on such converts for the reception of the Holy Spirit, unless they receive also the baptism of the Church.'[2] The argument

[1] *De Rebapt.* 10 'ideo cum salus nostra in baptismate Spiritus, quod plerumque cum baptismate aquae coniunctum est, sit constituta, si quidem per nos baptisma tradetur, integre et sollemniter et per omnia quae scripta sunt adsignetur atque sine ulla ullius rei separatione tradatur; aut si a minore clero per necessitatem traditum fuerit, eventum exspectemus ut aut suppleatur a nobis aut a Domino supplendum reservetur; si vero ab alienis traditum fuerit, ut potest hoc negotium et ut admittit corrigatur, quia Spiritus sanctus extra ecclesiam non sit...idcircoque paenitentiam agentibus...baptismate spiritali, id est manus inpositione episcopi et Spiritus sancti subministratione, subveniri debeat.'

[2] Cypr. *ep.* lxxii. 1: so *ep.* lxix. 10 'hoc tamen confitentur quod universi sive haeretici sive schismatici non habeant Spiritum sanctum et ideo baptizare quidem possint dare autem Spiritum sanctum non possint';

was without point, unless 'manum inponere ad accipiendum Spiritum sanctum' was what Stephen was actually accustomed to do. So a hundred and thirty years later Siricius, in his decretal letter to Himerius of Tarragona, directs that Arians, like Novatianists and other heretics, are to be received without rebaptism but 'with invocation of the sevenfold Spirit and laying on of the bishop's hands.'[1] So Innocent writes to Alexander of Antioch about converts from Arianism that nothing but their baptism is valid, and that their laity are to be received as penitents with laying on of hands and 'sanctification of the Holy Spirit.'[2] And so St Leo, addressing the Emperor about the affairs of the church of Alexandria after the brutal murder of the patriarch Proterius by the Monophysites, declares that the 'whole light of the sacraments has been put out, the offering of the sacrifice has come to an end, the consecration of the chrism has failed, and all the Mysteries have withdrawn themselves from the blood-stained hands of these guilty men.'[3] His language is rhetorical, and it is not clear how much he puts on the ground of heresy and how much on the ground of crime: but while tacitly excepting baptism, he quite

ep. lxx. 2 'quando constet ['is admitted by all'] oleum sanctificari et eucharistiam fieri apud illos omnino non posse'; *ep.* lxxiv. 5 'si effectum baptismi maiestati nominis tribuunt, ut qui in nomine Iesu Christi, ubicumque et quomodocumque baptizantur, innovati et sanctificati iudicentur...cur non eadem maiestas nominis praevalet in manus inpositione quam valuisse contendunt in baptismi sanctificatione?' Firmilian ap. Cypr. *ep.* lxxv. 8 'Stephanus et qui illi consentiunt...apud haereticos etiam ipsi confitentur Spiritum sanctum non esse.'

[1] Siricius, *ep.* i. (A.D. 385), § 1 'per invocationem solam septiformis Spiritus, episcopalis manus inpositione, catholicorum conventui sociamus.' Some of the 'brethren' still wished to rebaptize these Arian converts.

[2] Innocent, *ep.* xviii. (c. A.D. 414), § 3 'sub imagine paenitentiae ac sancti Spiritus sanctificatione per manus inpositionem suscipimus...solum baptisma ratum esse permittimus.'

[3] Leo, *ep.* clvi. (A.D. 457), § 5 'omne illic caelestium sacramentorum lumen extinctum, intercepta est sacrificii oblatio, defecit chrismatis sanctificatio, et parricidalibus manibus impiorum omnia se subtraxere mysteria.'

categorically denies the validity of their confirmation and their eucharist.

We have thus a catena of authorities in the Roman Church, extending over a period of two centuries, and consistent throughout in accepting the validity of any Baptism, and denying the validity of any Confirmation, administered outside the Church. If the gift of the Spirit could not be validly given in the sacrament of Confirmation, it follows *a fortiori* that it could not be validly given in the sacrament of Orders. If Arian laymen are imperfect Christians (argues pope Innocent in the passage just referred to) and their baptism is supplemented by penitence and the grace of the Holy Spirit, how can Arian priests be received as such at all, seeing that if the gift of the Spirit cannot be given among them in Confirmation, the fuller gift of the same Spirit in Ordination is certainly beyond their power ?[1]

On this matter of schismatical or heretical Orders there was agreement between the Western and the Eastern Churches, an agreement the more remarkable in view of their divergent attitude towards Baptism. We may cite once more St Basil's canonical letter to Amphilochius (cf. pp. 151, 157). At the one end he rejects heretical Baptism, and therewith heretical Orders. At the other end he not only accepts the baptism of those in temporary dissidence from the proper authorities of their church, but recognizes the possibility of clerics who have been led away into such insubordination being restored, after due penitence, to their original position[2]. These, however, would be people who had

[1] Innocent, *loc. cit.* 'nec dare eius plenitudinem possunt, quae maxime in ordinationibus operatur.' Cf. *ep.* vi. 'canones apud Nicaeam constituti paenitentes etiam ab infimis officiis clericorum excludant.' Long before, pope Cornelius had called Novatian's consecration as bishop an *εἰκονική τις καὶ ματαία χειροπιθεσία* (ap. Eus. *H.E.* vi. 43. 9).

[2] Basil, *ep.* 188, can. 1 *τοὺς δὲ ἐν ταῖς παρασυναγωγαῖς, μετανοίᾳ ἀξιολόγῳ καὶ ἐπιστροφῇ βελτιωθέντας, συνάπτεσθαι πάλιν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ,*

been originally ordained within the Church, and had never so far left it as to join any permanently organized schism. For the remaining class, schismatics whose baptism was allowed to stand, they must in any case receive the chrism among the faithful and only then approach the Mysteries[1]. Here again the repetition of Confirmation carries with it the nullity of Orders previously received.

Now the conditions which tended to recur more and more frequently from the time of the Nicene council onwards made quite imperative, for the sake of Christian unity and concord, every possible sacrifice, consistent with principle, which might serve to reconcile and assimilate separated bodies or congregations to the Catholic Church. It was not tolerable that the task of reunion should be brought up short in an *impasse*: and solution of the problem was sought in the century after the Peace of the Church along three distinct lines. (1) Where it was not a question of organized heresy or schism, but either of a purely local difficulty, or of controversy which was being fought out (however vital the points over which it raged) within the communion of the Church, then the theological objection to the recognition of Orders conferred outside the Church did not arise, and the problem could be solved, if the necessary temper of moderation prevailed on both sides, by allowing the clergy of the reconciled congregations to resume under Catholic authority the functions of their earlier ministry[2]. (2) Where however there was no doubt but that

ὥστε πολλάκις καὶ τοὺς ἐν βαθμῷ, συναπελθόντας τοῖς ἀνυποτάκτοις, ἐπειδὰν μεταμεληθῶσιν, εἰς τὴν αὐτὴν παραδέχεσθαι τάξιν.

[1] *Ib.* χρίεσθαι ἐπὶ τῶν πιστῶν καὶ οὕτω προσιέναι τοῖς μυστηρίοις. This emphasis on chrism is parallel to a Western writer's emphasis on the laying on of hands: the former being regarded as the characteristic rite of Confirmation in the East, the latter in the West.

[2] Nevertheless the presumption, in the Eastern Church of the fourth

the converts came from organized heresy or schism, in which, on the principles admitted down to the close of the fourth century, Confirmation and Orders were alike invalid, it might yet be possible to allow the clergy to continue their previous status on condition of receiving a fresh Ordination, just as the laity did in fact continue theirs on condition of receiving a fresh Confirmation. Of course in this event the disciplinary objection which was felt against the ordination of penitents would have tacitly to be waived. (3) All lesser difficulties were obviated and the Gordian knot was resolutely cut, when St Augustine applied to Confirmation and Orders the principle already adopted in the West with regard to Baptism, and asserted that for continuance, within the Church, of the ministry of a schismatical or heretical clergy nothing more was necessary than their reconciliation to the Catholic body and the sanction of Catholic authority. But this was so enormous a revolution in the ideas and practice heretofore prevalent, that it took nearly a thousand years before the older conceptions were finally ousted even in the West[1].

1. The first method finds use in various local developements or by-products of the long-protracted struggle with Arianism. The Antiochene schism illustrates one aspect in which the difficulty might present

century, was against recognizing the orders conferred by a factiously or irregularly appointed bishop: see the cases of Colluthus in Egypt and of Maximus at Constantinople, Athanasius *Apol. contra Arian.* 12, 76, Council of Constantinople (A.D. 381) can. 4.

[1] On all three hypotheses the position of a convert-bishop was, *bien entendu*, exceptional. There was no necessary limit to the number of priests in a diocese but there could only be one bishop; and where a Catholic bishop was already installed, all that could be done for the convert-bishop was either to find him a vacant diocese, or to allow him the right of succession to the existing bishop, or simply to guarantee him the retention of the dignity of the episcopate without its authority. See for instance Nicaea can. 8. Exceptionally, it was proposed at the Carthaginian conference of 411 that wherever the Donatists united with the Catholics, either the two bishops should preside alternately, or both should resign and a new bishop be elected by the joint votes of both parties.

itself. Antioch was one of the very few places where Catholics and Arians were early organized into rival communions with rival bishops: but it so happened that the Catholics were themselves split up into two rival camps, the smaller body perpetuating the tradition of the bishop Eustathius, an original adherent of the Athanasian cause, the larger belonging to the communion of Meletius, a bishop orthodox in his theology though Arian or Semi-Arian in his antecedents. These communities represented two different shades of Catholic theology, but they shared a common aversion to Arianism. Nevertheless they did not scruple to unchurch one another. Each side had something to say for itself, and each shewed itself unaccommodating: in spite of the irenic counsels of the synod held at Alexandria in 362, Lucifer consecrated a bishop for the Eustathian minority, and he was recognized by Egypt and the West, while Meletius, bishop of the majority, was recognized throughout the East. St Chrysostom, who was one of the clergy of the Meletian church, refuses to admit the orders of the other Catholic community: 'is it enough to say that they are orthodox, when the force of their ordination is null? and what is the good of all the rest, if care is not taken that orders are sound? we must be as jealous for a true ministry as for true faith.'[1] But in the next generation a milder spirit prevailed: Alexander, bishop of the greater church, welcomed the Eustathian community and their clergy, after the death of their bishop Evagrius, into union on equal terms with his own[2].

[1] Chrys. *in ep. ad Ephes.* hom. xi. (on Eph. iv. 15) *τί λέγεις; ἡ αὐτὴ πίστις ἐστίν, ὀρθόδοξοί εἰσι κἀκεῖνοι....ἀρκεῖν τοῦτο ἡγεῖσθε, εἰπέ μοι, τὸ λέγειν ὅτι ὀρθόδοξοί εἰσι, τὰ δὲ τῆς χειροτονίας οἴχεται καὶ ἀπόλωλε: καὶ τί τὸ ὄφελος, ταύτης οὐκ ἠκριβωμένης; ὥσπερ γὰρ ὑπὲρ τῆς πίστεως, οὕτω καὶ ὑπὲρ ταύτης μάχεσθαι χρή. ἐπεί, εἰ παντὶ ἔξεστι "πληροῦν τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῦ" κατὰ τοὺς παλαιούς, καὶ ἱερεῖς γίνεσθαι, παρίτωσαν πάντες, εἰκῆ τὸ θυσιαστήριον ᾠκοδόμηται τοῦτο, εἰκῆ τὸ πλήρωμα τῆς ἐκκλησίας, εἰκῆ τῶν ἱερέων ὁ ἀριθμός.*

[2] So specifically pope Innocent, *ep.* xiv., to the presbyter Boniface:

But the dominating feature of the situation, especially in the earlier days of the struggle with Arianism, was exactly the opposite of what had happened at Antioch. Save in the greater churches of the East, matters had rarely proceeded as far as to the definite organization of Arian and Catholic into separate churches: almost everywhere the contest was being fought out within the circumference of a single community. No rival episcopates divided the allegiance of the faithful: so innate (we must suppose) was the horror of schism that this desperate expedient was postponed till the last possible moment, and at Milan for instance the Catholic Dionysius, the Arian Auxentius, and the Catholic Ambrose occupied the see in turn. And it was just this coexistence of the two faiths, orthodox and heretical, within the one organization which made it possible, without violation of the principles accepted in the fourth century about properly schismatical and heretical orders, to recognize very widely the orders conferred by Arians. We learn from Theophilus of Alexandria that 'Ambrose of blessed memory received those who had received ordination from Auxentius his predecessor in Milan, and they received many others in the East who had not been ordained by the orthodox, lest, if these remained outside, the heresy of the Arians should strike root, and the flocks perish, and the greater portion of the body of the nations be lost: in this way they treated both those of Palestine and Phoenicia and many others, properly relaxing the strict rules of ordination for the sake of the salvation of the nations.'[1]

'ut et Evagrianos suis ordinibus ac locis, intemerata ordinatione quam acceperant a memorato, susciperet...ipsius civitatis episcopus frater meus Alexander.' Theophilus of Alexandria had urged this course upon Flavian of Antioch some years earlier (*c.* 400)—see the quotation in Severus' *Select Letters*, ed. E. W. Brooks, p. 303: on these letters the appended Note, pp. 211 ff., may be consulted.

[1] Quoted by Severus of Antioch: Brooks, *op. cit.* p. 304. The letter of Theophilus was written when Anastasius was pope, i.e. about 400 A.D.

The problem was most acute when at the end of the reign of Constantius almost all the Catholic bishops had, through deception or duress, assented to an unorthodox formula; as St Jerome phrased it 'ingemuit totus orbis et Arrianum se esse miratus est.' These bishops, so soon as the pressure from the State was removed, were anxious to put themselves right with the faith and with their flocks: and the council of Alexandria, under the guidance of St Athanasius, laid down as regards the rank and file of the bishops concerned no other condition, for their confirmation in the episcopate which they might seem to have forfeited, than their abjuration of the heresy at which they had connived. Only the leaders on the Arian side were excepted: in their case the traditional method was followed, and they were admitted as penitents but not allowed to reassume their clerical office[1].

The settlement breathed the large and statesman-like spirit of St Athanasius, but rigorists like Lucifer could criticize it from the point of view of the strict letter of law. An early work of Jerome, the *Dialogue against the Luciferians*, shews us a follower of Lucifer arguing that all bishops tainted with connivance in

[1] Τοῖς μὲν καταπεπτωκόσι καὶ προϊσταμένοις τῆς ἀσεβείας συγγινώσκειν μὲν μετανοοῦσι, μὴ διδόναι δὲ αὐτοῖς ἔτι τόπον κλήρου· τοῖς δὲ μὴ αὐθεντοῦσι μὲν τῆς ἀσεβείας ὑποσυρεῖσι δὲ δι' ἀνάγκην καὶ βίαν ἔδοξε δίδοσθαι μὲν συγγνώμην ἔχειν δὲ τὸν τόπον τοῦ κλήρου, μάλιστα δὲ ὅτι ἀπολογίαν πιθανὴν ἐπορίσαντο. Ath. *ad Rufinianum* ap. Mansi XII. 1030, Labbe-Coleti VIII. 720: cf. Rufinus, *H. E.* X. 29. Both the letter (to a certain bishop Rufinianus) in which Athanasius expounds and defends the settlement, claiming for it the support of both East and West, and also the passage dealing with the council in the *Church History* of Rufinus, were read at the Second Council of Nicaea in 787, and accepted as authoritative guides in the similar difficulties raised by the iconoclastic controversy. So great was the impression caused by the language of Athanasius, and the desire of each section at that council to claim his authority for their own view, that the passage was read no less than three times. A similar treatment, discriminating between the authors of a schism and their followers, had been practised a generation earlier by a council at Rome in the case of the Donatists, and by the council of Nicaea in the case of the Meletians: see pp. 176, 185 n. 1.

Arianism must needs be treated as the council of Alexandria treated the leaders, and be accepted as laymen only. But it must be remembered that the point at issue, as between Lucifer and Athanasius, was not the recognition of schismatical or heretical orders, but the restoration of bishops in Catholic orders, who without seceding from the Church had entangled themselves in the subtleties of Arian theology[1].

Under the same principle, namely that the difficulty about schismatical and heretical orders did not really arise so long as irregularities took place within the confines of the Church itself, will fall several of the instances which are cited in M. Saltet's treatise as indicating that the Roman church in the fifth century had already assimilated the teaching enunciated by St Augustine[2].

Thus Leo was consulted by Rusticus of Narbonne about the position of bishops who had gained possession of their sees unlawfully, and of the clergy ordained by them. He answers that such bishops are no true bishops, and cannot be accepted as such: but clergy ordained by these 'pseudoepiscopi' can be recognized[3].

[1] No doubt charity covered on this occasion a multitude of different degrees of episcopal weakness. For instance, if it was by virtue of the council's *concordat* that Theodore of Oxyrhynchus remained in possession of his see, he had been ordained to the episcopate by catholic bishops, had then adhered to the Arian bishop of Alexandria, the 'impious George,' had by him been reduced to the place of the laity, and afterwards had been by the same George ordained bishop again. To shew the genuineness of his recovered Catholicity, he won over some of the clergy of the schismatic bishop Apollonius, treated them as laymen, and ordained them again. The story reaches us, it is true, from a partial source, the *Libellus precum* of the Luciferian presbyters, Marcellinus and Faustinus (*Collectio Avellana*, ed. Guenther, C.S.E.L. xxxv. pp. 33—38). One almost wonders that Dr Hatch did not cite their language about 'egregius iste. *bis episcopus.*'

[2] Saltet, *op. cit.* p. 68, 'L'Église romaine pensait comme saint Augustin. Au v^e^ siècle, sa doctrine, sur cette question, se trouve exprimée dans des textes qui ne présentent aucune réelle difficulté.' I too think that these texts present no real difficulty, but my conclusion is the exact opposite of M. Saltet's.

[3] Leo, *ep.* 167.

Later again in the century a breach of communion occurred between the church of Rome and the church of Constantinople, because pope Felix, regarding the patriarch Acacius as disloyal to the Chalcedonian faith, had deposed and excommunicated him. Nevertheless both Felix and his successor Gelasius, as an act of grace and a help to reunion, ratified after Acacius' death the ordinations effected by him[1]. But any such action fell well within the limits of the precedents set in the fourth century; for Acacius, though he was out of communion with Rome from 484 till his death in 489, was all along the only bishop of Constantinople, and was throughout in communion with the orthodox of the East[2]. Whatever his personal demerits, those ordained by him were not ordained in an organized body existing outside and in opposition to the Church.

It is first in the letters of pope Anastasius II to Constantinople at the very end of the century that the recognition of Acacian orders begins to be defended on Augustinian grounds.

2. The problem was more complicated when those whom, for reasons of policy and charity, it was desired to reinstate in the active exercise of their clerical functions on reconciliation with the Catholic Church, had received their ordination in some one or other of the bodies organized outside it. After what we have already learnt of the distinction which tended to be drawn by Eastern churchmen in the fourth century

[1] Felix, *ep.* 13 (14) *ad Fravitam Constantinopolitanum*: 'nobis...provisuris...ut eorum quos ordinavit vel baptizavit Acacius, salva confessione catholica, pro caritatis ecclesiae redintegratione nihil pereat, quatenus "pax" illa proveniat quae "fecit utraque unum."' Gelasius, *ep.* 1 (3) *ad Euphemium Constantinopolitanum*: 'postremo faciamus aliquem corruisse, ad quem benignissime sublevandum paullulum quispiam velit inflecti...igitur per litteras...de his quos baptizavit quos ordinavit Acacius maiorum traditione confectam et veram praecipue religiosae sollicitudini congruam praebemus sine difficultate medicinam.'

[2] Father Puller, *Primitive Saints and the See of Rome*[3], pp. 386 ff., enumerates the saints who were in communion with Acacius.

between heresy and schism, it is quite natural to find that the council of Nicaea attempted a settlement of the two Puritan separations known at that moment in the East—the older schism of Novatian and the recent local schism of Meletius of Lycopolis[1] in Egypt—on a scale which would include provision for the terms on which their clergy could be recognized. For the action taken in regard to the Meletians we turn to the letter of the council to the church of Alexandria—the matter being purely local was not dealt with by canon—and we find that while Meletius as author of the schism was not to retain more than the mere name of his office, the bishops appointed by him might retain both the name of their office and its function, on the two conditions, (*a*) that their status should be ratified by 'a more sacramental ordination,' (*b*) that they should in any case take rank after the Catholic bishop and leave in his hands the administration of the diocese. In the event of an ex-Meletian bishop surviving his Catholic brother, the former might succeed to the see if the people elected him and the bishop of Alexandria approved[2]. Here the crucial words μυστικωτέρᾳ χειροτονίᾳ βεβαιωθέντας can hardly mean anything short of reordination. The comparative μυστικώτερος implies that some other form of χειροτονία was less 'sacramental' than that which they were now to receive: and the comparison can only be between their ordination as Meletians and their ordination as Catholics.

The case of the Novatianists is regulated in the eighth of the Nicene canons: and there are provisions for the Novatianist clergy as well as for the bishops. Since the schism was a long-established one, there was here no distinction to be drawn between the more and the less responsible. All were to be admitted, on con-

[1] To be carefully distinguished, of course, from the Meletius who a generation later became bishop of Antioch.

[2] ap. Socrates, *H. E.* i. 9.

ditions, to the exercise of their previous functions, save that the bishops are only to be bishops in the full sense where there were before no Catholic bishop or clergy at all; elsewhere the Novatianist bishop must be content with such position, whether of mere presbyter or of country bishop, as the Catholic bishop of the place might devise for him. The condition of admission to the exercise of their orders is of course the important thing; and unfortunately it is expressed in language, ὥστε χειροθετουμένους αὐτοὺς μένειν οὕτως ἐν τῷ κλήρῳ, which is ambiguous, since the word χειροθετούμενοι, taken alone, may indicate *either* the laying on of hands in ordination *or* the laying on of hands in the benediction and reconciliation of converts whose baptism was recognized as valid. Which of the two interpretations is correct has been a vexed question both in ancient and in modern times. Thus in the Acts of the Second Council of Nicaea, after the Nicene canon had been read out, 'the most reverend monks said "The canon commands them to be received χειροθετούμενοι." The most holy patriarch Tarasius said: "And what do you understand by the word χειροθετούμενον?" The most reverend monks said "My lord, we want to be told." The most holy patriarch Tarasius said: "Maybe the canon uses χειροθεσία here of benediction, and not of ordination."'[1] No doubt the word is patient of either meaning: but the general antecedent probabilities, taken with the evidence of early interpretations of the canon (which are set out at the end of this essay[2]), appear decisive against recognition of Novatianist orders.

It would seem that the practice of reordaining those clerics of schismatical or heretical bodies whom it was desired to retain in their ministry, introduced perhaps for the first time at the council of Nicaea, came to be in regular use both in the East and in large parts of the West during the next two centuries. The church

[1] Mansi XII. 1022, Labbe, VIII. 713.

[2] See Note, pp. 208 ff.

of Rome indeed transferred from holy Baptism to holy Orders its dislike of anything that looked like a reiteration of the sacrament, and it may be that it never authorized the reordination of schismatical or heretical clergy. Yet it does not follow that it recognized their existing orders: rather it emphasized the rule about penitence, and refused to see in them anything but laymen. So, in spite of the theology of St Augustine, did the African Church in regard to the Arian Vandals, and with the definite sanction and approval of the then pope, Agapetus[1]. But in Gaul and in Spain the councils of Orleans and of Saragossa admitted those of the Burgundian or Visigothic clergy whose faith and life justified it to the exercise of their ministry 'cum impositae manus benedictione' 'accepta denuo benedictione presbyteratus.' Just as the Arian churches were to be reconsecrated, so the Arian clergy were to be reordained[2].

For the East the existence and the limits of the practice of reordination in the fifth century are guaranteed for us by the Constantinopolitan document already cited (p. 158) with regard to the practice of rebaptism. Schismatics and certain heretics, i.e. Arians and Macedonians and Apollinarians, were not to be rebaptized, but they were to be anointed with chrism with the formula Σφραγὶς δωρεᾶς Πνεύματος ἁγίου, and then, as laymen, the former clergy are to be

[1] A.D. 535. See the letters in *Collectio Avellana*, ed. Guenther, C.S.E.L. XXXV. pp. 329, 331: 'requiri iam coeperat quomodo Arrianorum sacerdotes ad catholicam fidem suscipi oporteat, utrumne in suis honoribus an in laica communione...ex omnium quidem collegarum tacitis motibus nemini placere sensimus ut in suis honoribus Arriani suscipiantur: verumtamen convenire caritati credidimus, ut quid habeat sensus noster in publicam notitiam nemo produceret, nisi prius vel consuetudo nobis vel definitio Romanae ecclesiae proderetur'; the pope answers 'priorum nostrorum sententia redeuntes ad nos ex Arrianis quolibet modo in qualibet aetate illius pestilentiae labe pollutos...tanta ratiocinatione de ambitu honoris exclusit ut erubescerent aliud magis quaerere quam redire.'

[2] Council of Orleans, A.D. 511, canon 10: council of Saragossa, A.D. 592, canons 1 and 3.

ordained to whatever office they held before, presbyter, deacon, subdeacon, singer, or reader[1].

3. We have now reached the last stage of our long enquiry, and that is, of course, the teaching inculcated by St Augustine.

III

St Augustine's theory was not an absolutely new departure in the sense that there had never been any anticipations or adumbrations of it. The author of the *de Rebaptismate* uses at one point language, in contradiction to what he supposes (perhaps rightly) that St Cyprian would have said, which does suggest something like the Augustinian view[2]. St Jerome in his early tract against the Luciferians rejects, with Augustine, the older belief that the imposition of hands on the convert from heresy or schism was the Gift of the Holy Ghost, completing the inchoate and imperfect nature of the baptism received outside the Church[3]. Yet the reasoning of the two fathers upon the question is so different that it seems certain that the one does not depend upon the other. Augustine beautifully

[1] ὡς σπουδαῖοι λαϊκοὶ χειροτονοῦνται ἐκεῖνοι οἳ ἦσαν παρ' αὐτοῖς τὸ πρότερον εἴτε πρεσβύτεροι εἴτε κ.τ.λ. The document may be found complete in Beveridge *Synodicon* II. Annotationes, p. 100.

[2] *De Rebapt.* 10 'praeterea quid dicturus es de his qui plerumque ab episcopis pessimae conversationis baptizantur...aut quid statues de eis qui ab episcopis prave sentientibus aut imperitioribus fuerint baptizati, quando non ad liquidum et integre vel etiam aliter quam oportet in traditione sacramenti fuerint locuti, certe aut interrogaverint quid aut interrogantes a respondentibus audierint quod minime ita interrogari aut responderi debet, quod tamen non valde illam nostram rectam fidem laedat?...dicturus es enim utique pro tua singulari diligentia hos quoque denuo baptizandos esse, cum maxime eis res desit aut obstet quominus inviolabile illud divinum mysterium fidei intemeratum possint accipere. sed enim, virorum optime, reddamus et permittamus virtutibus caelestibus vires suas, et dignationi divinae maiestatis concedamus operationes proprias.'

[3] See above pp. 164 ff.

interprets this imposition of hands as the bestowal of the gift of charity, 'the very bond of peace and of all virtues,' the greatest gift of the Spirit, without which no other gifts have any saving power, which is imparted to the penitent on reconciliation with the Church. Jerome on the other hand, whose presbyterian prejudices are rarely far below the surface when he has to deal with the Ministry and the Sacraments, belittles the imposition of hands as strictly speaking a superfluous rite: the Holy Spirit was given in baptism, and the laying on of the bishop's hands was more a means of enhancing the episcopal dignity than anything else: if our 'high-priests' had not these opportunities of power and eminence to occupy their attention, there would be as many schisms in the churches as bishops[1].

Thus to whatever extent Western theology may have commenced to move in a direction of which the Augustinian theory was logically the only goal, it is still true that for the construction and perfection of a coherent theology of the Sacraments and their relation to the Church, on the lines of the developement of Western thought, Augustine worked out his own material and owed singularly little to any predecessors. The elements which combined to produce his conclusion may be roughly summarized under three heads.

In the first place, then, a certain view of Baptism was, from the council of Arles (314 A.D.) onwards, universally accepted throughout the Catholic West, and formed part of the system of doctrine and practice to which St Augustine attached himself by entering the Catholic Church at Milan in 387. No doubt this view had not always prevailed in Africa, and St Augustine as

[1] *Dialogus adv. Luciferianos* 9 'si hoc loco quaeris, quare in ecclesia baptizatus nisi per manus episcopi non accipiat Spiritum sanctum, quem nos adserimus in vero baptismate tribui...factitatum reperimus ad honorem potius sacerdotii quam ad legem necessitatis...ecclesiae salus in summi sacerdotis dignitate pendet, cui si non exsors quaedam et ab omnibus eminens detur potestas, tot in ecclesiis efficientur schismata quot sacerdotes.'

an African bishop found the authority of St Cyprian in favour of the more rigid attitude towards non-catholic baptism a serious stumbling-block in his way when he tried to recommend the accepted Western doctrine to African readers : the greater part of his principal treatise on the subject, the seven books entitled *de baptismo*[1], is devoted to an examination of St Cyprian's writings and action in the controversy. If the Donatists could appeal to the authority of his teaching, the Catholics, argues Augustine, had a still greater right to claim him as one of themselves, since he had definitely refused to make the difference about rebaptism a ground of schism. And the sacrament of Baptism was still, at the beginning of the fifth century as much as in the middle of the third, the pivot of African controversy. Holy Orders hardly come into the immediate purview of St Augustine more directly than into that of St Cyprian.

But, and this is the second point, St Augustine's mind, if subtle, was also strong and logical. It moved on broad lines, and to broad conclusions : within its own limits it worked very surely. To say that he was ill-informed on the history of Christian theology[2] and on the conditions actually prevailing in the Greek churches, or that he lacked the many-sided intelligence for instance of St Basil, is only to say that even the greatest of Christian saints and thinkers is after all human. But the result was that he extended the argument for the reception of heretical baptism to the reception of heretical orders without ever really discussing the possibility that the one question admitted

[1] This and the other anti-Donatist writings of St Augustine have been admirably edited by Petschenig in vols. li.—liii. of the Vienna *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* (1908, 1909, 1910).

[2] E.g. he presumes that the Cyprianic view on baptism was in St Cyprian's time 'adversus totius orbis morem,' *de bapt.* iv. 6 (8) : or again he supposes that, since the Nicene council rejected Paulianist baptism, the Paulianists did not use the baptismal formula (*de haeresibus ad Quod-vult-deum*, xliv).

of any difference of treatment from the other. As he put the case, no doubt they did not. Even the theology of St Cyprian, on the fundamental question whether or how far the gifts and promises of Christ are valid beyond the communion of the Church of Christ, is perhaps considered by Augustine with unconscious reference to the form in which it was presented by his contemporaries. Those who gave themselves out as heirs of the Cyprianic tradition had somewhat shifted their ground, and now laid the main stress not so much on the prerogative of the Church as on the character and commission of the minister of the Sacrament. Would Augustine's reply that it was Christ and not the human minister who was the real agent in His Sacraments meet the case equally well, if Christ had to be contrasted not with the minister but with the Church?

Thus, in the third place, we cannot hope to understand this whole department of St Augustine's theological activity unless we begin by saturating ourselves in the conditions of African Christianity during the century that followed on the Peace of the Church. Nor is this undertaking so simple as it sounds, since the survival of Catholic literature and the disappearance of heretical or schismatical literature has made it extraordinarily difficult to represent to ourselves accurately, during the earlier phases of each struggle, the real position of the parties to the various controversies that rent the Church. The ultimate victories of the Catholic cause must not blind us to the long uncertainties of the issue. Between Constantine and Theodosius some sort of Arianism must have seemed, throughout most of the Eastern Churches, to be making good its claim to be the orthodox religion of the day. For a longer period, and with still more clearness, the claim of the Donatist communion to be the national and traditional Church of Africa must have appeared irrefutable. Both numbers and enthusiasm were

ranged on the Donatist side: the Catholics were a minority, dependent for support on foreign sympathy and secular interference[1]. Probably many of the best people were Donatists: Tyconius the commentator would be a fairer representative of the sect than the Circumcellions. What the Catholic body needed, what St Augustine set himself to do, was not merely to convince individual Donatists of the unsoundness of their position, but to make easy the return of the Donatist masses to Catholic unity.

The problem was no longer of the same type as that which had faced the Church in the days of St Irenaeus. As between Caecilianists and Donatists, or a little later between Chalcedonians and Monophysites, the task was that of reconciling large masses of separated Christians, whose separatedness was often as much due to misunderstanding as to conscious heresy or schism. Moreover as time went on, there was no longer any question of individual responsibility, on one side or the other, for acts that had helped to cause the separation. Mutual goodwill between the parties was of course the first condition precedent of a settlement: but before anything like corporate reunion could be effected, it was necessary to settle the status both of the now conforming lay people and also of the now conforming ministry. It was obvious that unity was likely to be far more easy to bring about where not only the Donatist laity could be received as baptized members on terms of equality with the Catholic laity, but the Donatist clergy could be received through similar recognition of their orders among the Catholic clergy. To St Augustine the one thing needful was the desire on the part of the sectaries for reconciliation: if, desiring this, they shewed that they were

[1] At the council of Sardica Hosius appeals to the testimony of Gratus of Carthage for the habit of African (Catholic) bishops of running off to court.

possessed of the supreme grace of Christian charity, they should be met by no less charity on the part of the Church. To lay too exclusive a stress on the prerogative of Catholic Orders might be to imperil the attainment of the great object of unity.

With so much premised we can now approach the consideration of St Augustine's argument.

Historically he deals only with past developements in Africa and the West. He cannot of course deny St Cyprian's propaganda for rebaptism : but he pleads that Cyprian treated the preservation of Christian unity as a more precious thing even than the prevalence of a correct discipline of the Sacraments—if the Roman church received heretics without baptizing them, the Roman church was in Cyprian's eyes wrong, but he did not in consequence break off communion with it. Therefore St Cyprian would have approved rather of those who followed him in avoiding schism than of those who followed him in his practice of rebaptism but violated the unity of the Church. Furthermore, in Cyprian's time the Church as a whole had not spoken, and each community or group of communities was entitled to defend the practice which seemed to it the best : but the authority of 'a plenary council of the universal Church' has superseded any local custom. Before the synod of Arles in 314 had decided against rebaptism the matter was open : since that time loyalty to the Catholic body demands that the Africans should come into line with the other provinces. In order that they should so come into line, the Church had from the start made the way very easy for them. Already at the council held in Rome (A.D. 313) to examine the respective claims of Caecilian and Donatus it was provided—and the African Catholics had always carried out the provision—that the separated bishops or clergy should be received on conversion into whatever rank they had previously held, even if their

ordination had been schismatic to begin with. The same policy was followed in the Arian troubles; Lucifer resented it and, because he had lost the light of charity, fell into the darkness of schism. But the Church put above all other considerations the chance of recovering the scattered members of the flock[1].

Doctrinally the Donatists had put in the forefront of their case the old difficulty of the unworthiness of the minister in its relation to the effect of the sacrament.

The doubt whether the good gifts of God can be mediated to His people by the hands of evil men had vexed the minds of Christian thinkers from a very early period. Was a right life, it was asked, any less necessary than a right faith as a qualification for the stewardship of the mysteries of God? So St Irenaeus had bidden his readers to shun, together with heretics and schismatics, all pseudo-elders, and to cleave to those only who 'combine with holy orders soundness in word and conduct without offence,' 'who have the Church's succession from the apostles, whose life and teaching are both without reproach.'[2] So again St Cyprian had instructed the faithful of the church of Assuras that their bishop, having sacrificed in the persecution, had lost the grace of the Holy Spirit, and

[1] Aug. *ep.* clxxxv. (c. A.D. 417) § 47 'sic multitudinibus per schismata et haereses pereuntibus subvenire consuevit. hoc displicuit Lucifero quia factum est in eis suscipiendis atque sanandis qui veneno perierant Arriano: et cui displicuit, in tenebras cecidit schismatis amisso lumine caritatis. hoc erga istos ab initio servavit Africana catholica, ex episcoporum sententia qui in ecclesia Romana inter Caecilianum et partem Donati iudicaverunt damnatoque uno quodam Donato, qui auctor schismatis fuisse manifestatus est, ceteros correctos (etiamsi extra ecclesiam ordinati essent) in suis honoribus suscipiendos esse censuerunt: non quod etiam foris ab unitate corporis Christi possent habere Spiritum sanctum, sed maxime propter eos quos foris positi possent decipere.' For the distinction made between Donatus and the rest compare the parallel action of the Alexandrine council of 362, p. 173 note 1. But it is difficult to think that the Roman council can really have had occasion to deal with any persons ordained in schism.

[2] See above p. 125.

that the Eucharistic offering could not be sanctified where the sanctifying Spirit was absent[1]. And so also Origen, in his *Homilies on Leviticus*, had stated his own opinion (at least as Rufinus renders him) that the unworthy priest is a priest neither in name nor in reality[2].

Therefore the Donatists no doubt thought their position quite unassailable when they maintained that, if Caecilian of Carthage had been consecrated bishop by a *traditor*, such as they asserted Felix his consecrator to have been, the whole proceeding was null, and all Caecilian's episcopal acts were invalid and unreal from the start. Rooted in that conviction, Parmenian the Donatist asks scornfully whether it is compatible with the strictness of God's law that 'life can be brought to any by the dead, or cure by the wounded, or sight by the blind, or clothing by the naked, or cleansing by one who is himself defiled?'

Now, attractive to the puritan point of view as this stern ideal always shewed itself to be, it is open to two answers, each of them in its own way conclusive. The first answer is that if the sacraments ministered by evil men simply convey no real grace to the recipient, then we must conclude that no one can be absolutely sure that he has been truly baptized or ordained, since no one can be absolutely sure of the inner character of the bishop or priest who has ordained or baptized him. It might of course be said in reply that when we have done all that we can reasonably do in guarding the security of the sacraments from the ministration of evil men, we must leave the rest to God. But obviously in practice it would not be easy to fix the point at which the characters of the clergy and the consequent validity of their ministration would remain immune from

[1] See above p. 162 n.

[2] Origen *in Levit.* v. 12 'Ego puto quod...non est sacerdos et...non potest...sacerdos nominari.'

suspicion. And St Augustine's first and principal desert in putting on right lines the theology of the sacraments is that he saw the truest answer to the whole difficulty. We need not be over-careful and troubled about the worthiness of the ministrant in relation to the sacraments ministered by him, simply because he is only a minister, an agent of a Master whose power is behind every act done in His name. If Parmenian retorts that God acts, but acts through a human representative, Augustine reminds him that God acted through Judas who was sent to preach with the rest of the apostles, and through the Pharisees for those who did the good things which the Pharisees, though they did not practise them themselves, still taught to their disciples[1].

Yet this answer of St Augustine's, while it was both an adequate refutation of the main Donatist contention and in itself a positive contribution to Christian theology, does not really cover the whole ground. It does not touch the central stronghold of the Cyprianic position. The thesis that the gifts and graces of the Christian sacraments cannot be obtained except through the Christian society is obviously not affected by the instances of Judas, who was a commissioned apostle, or the Pharisees, who were authorized exponents of the law. Nevertheless it is a parallel form of the same argument that St Augustine employs time after time, in one way of putting it after another, throughout those books of the *de baptismo* which are devoted to the

[1] Aug. *contra epistulam Parmeniani* ii. 14 (32) 'ut quid ergo Parmenianus...dicit "numquam divinae legis censura patietur ut vivificare quemquam mortuus possit, curare vulneratus, inluminare caecus, vestire nudus, emundare pollutus"? Dominus enim suscitat mortuos, Dominus curat vulneratos, Dominus inluminat caecos, Dominus vestit nudos, Dominus emundat pollutos. quid sibi arrogat quae hominis non sunt? ..."sed Deus" inquit "haec per hominem facit." facit sane, sed fecit et per Iudam quem ad evangelium praedicandum cum ceteris misit, fecit et per Pharisaeos in eis qui bona quae per eos audiebant ipsi faciebant cum illi non facerent quae dicebant.' Cf. Amb. *de Spiritu* i. prol. § 18.

examination of the Cyprianic literature on rebaptism. The heretic or schismatic outside the Church is in a similar position to the man of vicious life or erroneous faith within the Church. Put the case of a Catholic Christian who by reading or reflexion or discussion comes through God's grace to a more correct understanding of the faith, which he had incorrectly held at the time of his baptism : you would not therefore rebaptize him. Then why should you rebaptize a heretic because his faith was unsound at the time of his baptism ?[1] Take again the Catholic Christian who when he came to be baptized had had no purpose of amendment of life, but remained vicious and unrepentant ; he is outside the true unity of the Church till he repents, but you do not rebaptize him on repentance. Then why should you rebaptize a schismatic, who is likewise outside the unity of the Church till he repents of his schism and is reconciled to the Church ?[2] Let us imagine two persons, the one a Catholic of vicious life, the other a heretic but of moral life ; why should Christ's sacrament be recognized in one of them and not in the other ? In fact it is the same in both, and is not man's property but God's, and is everywhere good however bad they are that receive it[3].

[1] *De bapt.* iii. 14 (19) 'neque enim parva res est in ipsa intus catholica tenere integram fidem, ita ut omnino non de aliqua creatura sed de ipso Deo nihil aliter credat quam veritas habet. numquidnam ergo, si in ipsa catholica baptizatus postea legendo audiendo et pacifice disserendo, ipso Domino revelante, cognoverit aliter se antea credidisse quam debuit, denuo baptizandus est ?'

[2] *ib.* iii. 18 (23) 'pax autem huius unitatis in solis bonis est, vel iam spiritalibus vel ad spiritalia concordi oboedientia proficientibus ; in malis autem non est, sive foris tumultuentur sive intus cum gemitu tolerentur et baptizent et baptizentur. sicut autem isti qui intus cum gemitu tolerantur, quamvis ad...unitatem et ad illam gloriosam ecclesiam "non habentem maculam aut rugam aut aliquid eiusmodi" non pertineant, tamen si corrigantur et se pessimos ad baptismum accessisse fateantur non rebaptizantur ...sic et qui apertius foris sunt si eadem sacramenta sumpserunt, cum correcti ad ecclesiae veniunt unitatem, non iterato baptismo sed eadem caritatis lege et unitatis vinculo liberantur.'

[3] *ib.* iv. 20 (27) 'propositis itaque duobus, uno catholico cum his

If it is asked whether the remission of sins proper to baptism can be given by a heretic or to a heretic, Augustine has the same comparison in reserve. Just in so far as a heretic cannot give remission of sins, so also a bad bishop, however Catholic, cannot give it. Just in so far as a heretic cannot receive remission of sins, so neither can an unrepentant recipient of Catholic baptism[1]. Remission is obtained at the intercession of the true Church, by the prayers of the saints, that is, by the "sad call" of the One Only Dove, whoever be the baptizer, provided those who are baptized belong to the peace of the true Church; but it is not really available either for heretics without or for evil men within[2]. If the holiness of Baptism may be said in some sense to carry with it this remission, yet the benefit is immediately suspended until the sin is put away[3]. The sacrament is really and fully there, but it cannot be appropriated; 'sacramenti integritas ubique cognoscitur, sed ad peccatorum illam inrevocabilem remissionem extra unitatem ecclesiae non valebit.'[4]

If lastly it is asked whether the gift of the Holy Spirit is received in heretical baptism, St Augustine would indeed answer in the negative; but he would carefully guard himself against the view that Baptism was the one sacrament which could be validly administered outside the Church, and that the laying on of hands with which the convert was received into the Church represented the completion of Baptism by the Gift of the Spirit in Confirmation. This laying on of

omnibus vitiis, alio haeretico sine his (quae possunt non esse in haeretico), quamvis contra fidem non uterque disputet, et tamen contra fidem uterque vivat et spe vana uterque fallatur et a caritate spiritali uterque dissentiat et ob hoc uterque ab illius unicae columbae corpore alienus sit, cur in uno eorum sacramentum Christi cognoscimus, in alio nolumus, quasi aut huius aut huius sit, cum in utroque idem sit et nonnisi Dei sit et quamvis in pessimis bonum sit?'

[1] *ib.* iii. 18 (23), i. 12 (18).
[2] *ib.* iii. 18 (23).
[3] *ib.* iii. 13 (18).
[4] *ib.* iii. 17 (22).

hands was necessary, because otherwise it might seem that heresy was no sin to be repented of: but it was in itself nothing else than prayer over a man, and so was capable, unlike baptism, of indefinite repetition. If older theologians had been accustomed to say that the Holy Spirit could be given by imposition of hands in the Catholic Church only, they must be understood to mean not that there could be any distinction drawn between sacraments that were valid outside the Church and sacraments that were not, but rather that charity, the greatest gift of the Spirit, without which no other virtues, real and admirable as they are in themselves, avail for salvation—charity, which none can truly possess who are separated from the communion of the Catholic Church—'is spread abroad in our hearts by the Holy Spirit that is given to us.' This is the sense in which hands are laid on them and they receive the Holy Spirit. That charity which covers the multitude of sins is the especial gift of Catholic peace and unity[1].

And just as the sacrament of Confirmation cannot be divorced from the sacrament of Baptism, so neither can the sacrament of holy Orders: all three stand or fall together. Orders are really conferred outside the Church exactly in the same sense and to the same degree as Baptism, and as Baptism cannot be repeated so neither can Ordination. Some Donatists, it appears, upheld the mediating view, common (as we have seen) in the Eastern Church and in the early Western Church,

[1] *De bapt.* iii. 16 (21) 'quodlibet haeretici et schismatici accipiant, caritas quae cooperit multitudinem peccatorum proprium donum est catholicae unitatis et pacis: nec eius in omnibus, quia nec omnes sunt eius...praeter ipsam tamen esse illa caritas non potest sine qua cetera, etiamsi agnosci et adprobari possunt, prodesse tamen et liberare non possunt. manus autem inpositio non sicut baptismus repeti non potest; quid est enim aliud nisi oratio super hominem?' *ib.* v. 23 (33) 'propter caritatis autem copulationem quod est maximum donum Spiritus sancti, sine quo non valent ad salutem quaecumque alia sancta in homine fuerint, manus haereticis correctis inponitur.'

which recognized the validity of no sacrament outside the Church save Baptism: 'baptismum quidem non amittit qui recedit ab ecclesia, sed ius dandi tamen amittit.' To Augustine the two sacraments, whether as a matter of theory or of practice, stand on the same level. Each of them is a sort of consecration; neither of them, outside the charity of unity, works profit to the recipient. But the sacraments are real wherever they are, and just as a lay convert from heresy becomes on reconciliation a layman of the Church without further baptism, so a clerical convert reconciled to the Church acts in his clerical capacity—if it is determined that he should do so, which is a matter of discipline and expediency in each case—without further ordination[1].

According then to St Augustine's presentation the sacraments are not the sacraments of schismatics or heretics, but the sacraments of God and the Church, wherever they are found and whithersoever they are removed[2]. But if the sacraments are God's and are wholly independent of the human agent, then the question arises whether a pagan can validly baptize. Augustine raises the point himself, but without venturing to decide it; it is too serious a problem for

[1] *Contra ep. Parmeniani*, ii. 13 (28) 'nulla ostenditur causa cur ille qui ipsum baptismum amittere non potest, ius dandi possit amittere. utrumque enim sacramentum est, et quadam consecratione utrumque homini datur, illud cum baptizatur illud cum ordinatur, ideoque in catholica utrumque non licet iterari. nam si quando ex ipsa parte venientes etiam praepositi bono pacis, correcto schismatis errore, suscepti sunt, etiamsi visum est opus esse ut eadem officia gererent quae gerebant non sunt rursus ordinati, sed sicut baptismus in eis ita ordinatio mansit integra; quia in praecisione fuerat vitium, quod unitatis pace correctum est, non in sacramentis, quae ubicumque sunt ipsa sunt...sicut autem habent in baptismo quod per eos dari possit, sic in ordinatione ius dandi; utrumque quidem ad perniciem suam, quamdiu caritatem non habent unitatis. sed tamen aliud est non habere, aliud perniciose habere, aliud salubriter habere.' *ib.* 13 (30) 'si enim utrumque sacramentum est, quod nemo dubitat, cur illud non amittitur et illud amittitur? neutri sacramento iniuria facienda est.'

[2] *De bapt.* i. 14 (22) 'non est baptismus ille schismaticorum vel haereticorum, sed Dei et ecclesiae, ubicumque fuerit inventum et quocumque translatum.'

anything short of a full conciliar pronouncement[1]. To answer the question in the affirmative would indeed appear to be something like a *reductio ad absurdum* of the Augustinian position : the sacraments would become mere magical formulas, independent of any recognition on man's part of the gifts of God. And it may be permitted to think that the great doctor did, in his later work on Baptism, in effect imply a negative answer to his own question. What we blame, he writes, in heresies or schisms is in each case the particular errors of the sect, and in one and all of them the tremendous error of separation, which suspends all benefit of the sacraments. But the sacraments themselves, so long as what is accepted and done is accepted and done as in the true Church—that is, presumably, with the same form and matter and with the same general intention—we do not blame, on the contrary we approve[2].

It will have been noticed that the language of 'succession' is absent from the teaching of St Augustine on the Donatist controversy as it has been summarized in the preceding pages. That does not mean that he could not on occasion use it: it does mean that it did not stand in the forefront of his argument. Perhaps the most notable passage in which the appeal to the successions is developed occurs not in a treatise at all but in a letter, and in response to a definite challenge from the other side. A certain Generosus, a layman of

[1] *Contra ep. Parm.* ii. 13 (30) 'utrum et ab his qui numquam fuerunt christiani possit baptismus dari: nec aliquid hinc temere adfirmandum est sine auctoritate tanti concilii quantum tantae rei sufficit.' In the legend of St Genesius of Rome (the same story is told of a St Gelasinus in Phoenicia) a mock baptism is performed upon the stage by one actor on another, and the actor who has just been thus baptized at once confesses himself a Christian and dies a martyr.

[2] *De bapt.* i. 13 (21) 'illa quae schismatici vel haeretici *non aliter habent nec aliter agunt quam vera ecclesia,* cum ad nos veniunt non emendamus sed potius adprobamus: in quibus enim non dissentiunt a nobis, in eis non disiunguntur a nobis.'

Cirta (Constantina), the capital of Numidia, had had the claims of the Donatist episcopal succession in that city pressed upon his notice: and Augustine's 53rd epistle is written to refute the claim and to enforce the greater weight and antiquity of the successions in the apostolic churches—the church of Rome, and the other churches to which St Paul's epistles were addressed—with all of whom the Catholics of Africa were in full communion, while the Donatists were not. If we are to talk of successions, where should reliance more confidently be placed than on a succession which goes back to the apostle on whom, as representing the whole body, the Lord had promised that He would build His Church? Even if it were proved that there had been at any point a 'traditor' bishop in the Roman succession[1], that would prove nothing against church or christians of Rome, who put their trust not in man but in the Lord. And if a 'traditor' bishop broke the succession and destroyed its validity, then the Donatist succession at Cirta was no better off than the Catholic succession at Rome, seeing that their first bishop after the outbreak of the schism, Silvanus, had been clearly convicted of the offence. But after all these charges and countercharges are to Augustine only a secondary issue: the struggle must be fought out on other grounds.

St Augustine then was willing enough to take up the succession argument if challenged on it: and when he did take it up, he meant quite obviously succession in the chair of a single see. The apostolic succession of the church of Rome is, as with St Irenaeus, from holder to holder, not from consecrator to consecrated. But, obviously also, the argument did not specially affect him, whether because he had not the historical interest, or because the new conception of the validity of

[1] Augustine may be alluding here to the stories circulated by the Donatists about pope Marcellinus: if so, there is the more point in the *tu quoque* which follows. For the Latin of this passage see p. 206.

non-catholic orders ultimately reacted upon the idea of the Succession as something belonging exclusively to the Church. If the Succession was no longer thus confined, then episcopal consecration was left as the only test of validity, and it was a test which there was never any call to apply till the era of the Reformation.

IV

The process of our investigation has revealed the existence in the patristic period of real variations of thought and expression as to the right attitude to adopt towards the orders conferred in heresy or schism. For three different forms of judgement—for rejection *en bloc*, for acceptance *en bloc*, and for the combination of acceptance in some cases with rejection in others—there is good ancient precedent: it would be difficult to hold that any one of these three views can be ruled out as untenable on Catholic authority. But if the recognition of these divergences in early Christian theory or practice is one part of the conclusion to be drawn from our enquiry, it is not the whole, and it is not even the more weighty part. Unhistorical as it would be not to face to the full such inequalities of temper and teaching as meet us among the Catholic writers, we should be still more false to historical truth if we did not appreciate the superior importance of the conceptions which they shared as a common inheritance. And these, in the sphere that concerns us, are principally two.

In the first place, there was complete agreement as to the doctrine of the Catholic Church, the visible fellowship of the disciples, the Body of Christ. The separatist communities, at least from the middle of the third century onwards, had with the idea of the Church no quarrel: for the most part the *rationale* of their separate organization was that each set of them claimed in turn for itself to be the true embodiment of this unique society. Even those who laid special stress on

the predicate Holy, and based a schism on their interpretation of it, would not have allowed that they forgot that the Church was not only Holy, but One and Catholic as well. Still less was there any possibility of disagreement on this head between any of the Fathers whose writings we have had under examination. St Augustine, with all his tenderness towards the mass of unthinking schismatics of his day, was just as clear as St Irenaeus or St Cyprian that some essential grace was lacking to those who were definitely outside the Church: the earlier theologians would have said that what was wanting was the grace of the Holy Spirit in Baptism and the whole cycle of Christian graces that follow on incorporation into the Christian fellowship; Augustine would put it that what was wanting was the crown of Christian virtues, the gift *par excellence* of the Spirit, and that until unity brought charity in its train other gifts and graces were as it were held in suspense. On the supreme duty of communion with the visible fellowship of the brethren in the one true fold of the Redeemer there was no shadow of wavering, however many the representatives, or however various the types and local expressions, of the Christian tradition.

And then secondly we may assume as almost axiomatic that, whatever the differences of theory about the recognition of non-catholic sacraments, recognition was in fact never given save where what was done outside the Church was done in the same manner, and with the same general belief in the meaning of the act, as it was done within the Church[1]. In this sense Baptism, whether within or without the Church, was administered by means of water and the profession of the Name of the Holy Trinity[2]: Orders, whether within or without,

[1] 'non aliter habent nec aliter agunt quam vera ecclesia,' p. 192, n. 2.

[2] It was of course because there was—at any rate in the conceptions of St Augustine's age—no special minister of the sacrament of Baptism, as there was of the sacrament of Orders, that St Augustine could put the problem referred to on p. 191 *supra* about a pagan baptizer.

by laying on of the bishop's hands and prayer for the outpouring of the Spirit for the work of ministry. Without the Church as well as within, Baptism was regarded as the effectual admission into the New Covenant of Redemption; and the ministry of the bishop in control of the due exercise of all the sacramental functions of the Church, the ministry of the presbyter in the service of the Eucharist, as well as any other ministries of persons duly appointed and 'ordained' for special purposes, were regarded as true 'operations' of the Spirit in the Body of Christ. The Sacraments, and the theology of the Sacraments, were one and the same thing in the belief of catholics and schismatics, of orthodox and heretical, from the time when, and in the case of the sects for which, the recognition of non-catholic sacraments began to be conceivable.

Therefore, given this homogeneity of the essential doctrine of the Church and of the Sacraments, it would not really have meant any fundamental difference of position if the Fathers had been found to apply in different ways the terminology of the Apostolic Succession. As a matter of fact, there is not, within the patristic period and even considerably later, any deviation from the common and traditional conception of the meaning of Apostolic Succession, as we have seen it in vigour from the time of Hegesippus and Irenaeus onwards. The conception that in post-Reformation times has superseded it in the Western Church may possibly be justified as a logical result of asserting the validity of non-catholic orders, but it was at least a novel departure and must be frankly recognized as such. Whether it was wholly a good departure may be doubted: certainly the more modern view is often so phrased that it seems to lend colour to a mechanical conception of the Sacraments, a danger from which the patristic view is wholly free.

NOTE ON 'SUCCESSION' LANGUAGE IN NON-CHRISTIAN SOURCES[1]

A. *In the historians.*

The verb διαδέχεσθαι is commonly used of successors generally. Appian, *Illyr.* 7 Πύρρος ὁ τῆς Ἠπείρου βασιλεὺς...καὶ οἱ τὰ Πύρρου διαδεξάμενοι. Strabo XVII. c. 795 Πτολεμαῖος γὰρ ὁ Λάγου διεδέξατο Ἀλέξανδρον, ἐκεῖνον δὲ ὁ Φιλάδελφος, τοῦτον δὲ ὁ Εὐεργέτης, εἶθ' ὁ Φιλοπάτωρ ὁ τῆς Ἀγαθοκλείας, εἶθ' ὁ Ἐπιφανής, εἶθ' ὁ Φιλομήτωρ, παῖς παρὰ πατρὸς ἀεὶ διαδεχόμενος. Therefore when we find the verb used of the successors of Alexander the Great, e.g. Polybius IX. 34 §§ 4, 11 οἱ διαδεξάμενοι αὐτόν, we need not give it any technical meaning.

But the noun διάδοχος, or rather (in the plural) διάδοχοι, came to be specially used of the successors of Alexander, and in particular of the first generation of successors, who shared Alexander's empire between them. If Diodorus, when he describes Hieronymus of Cardia as ὁ τὰς τῶν διαδόχων ἱστορίας γεγραφώς, was incorporating the actual title of the book to which he refers, then this technical use is very ancient, since Hieronymus lived in the third century B.C.: but it is of course possible that Diodorus was paraphrasing the title in the language of his own time. Again, Dionysius of Halicarnassus (I. 61 A) refers to a work of Hieronymus as ἡ περὶ τῶν ἐπιγόνων πραγματεία, and it may be that this is the same work that Diodorus described as αἱ τῶν διαδόχων ἱστορίαι: Susemihl, however, holds that the work περὶ τῶν ἐπιγόνων was a continuation of the work περὶ τῶν διαδόχων, and if this is so the distinction between Diadochi and Epigoni, which Droysen has used in the titles of his second and third volumes, perhaps goes back to Hieronymus.

There was another curious technical use of the term διάδοχος. At the Ptolemaic court it was the name of one of the orders of courtiers, below συγγενής and above plain φίλος.

B. *In the philosophers.*

i. Διαδοχή, διαδοχαί, for the *successions* of the philosophers.

AETIUS *Placita* I. 3. 1, Plutarch *Epitome* I. 3: Diels, *Doxographi Graeci* 276. 9 (the passage is considered by Diels to be an addition

[1] For the material of section A of this Note I am indebted to Mr Edwyn Bevan: for that of section B to my colleague Mr C. C. J. Webb. To both my best thanks are due.

of Plutarch's own to the text of the *Placita*). Δοκεῖ δὲ ὁ ἀνὴρ οὗτος [*sc.* Thales] ἄρξαι τῆς φιλοσοφίας, καὶ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ ἡ Ἰωνικὴ αἵρεσις προσηγορεύθη· ἐγένοντο γὰρ πλεῖσται διαδοχαὶ φιλοσοφίας.

Ib. I. 3. 7 : Diels *op. cit.* 280. 8. Οὗτοι μὲν ἐφεξῆς ἀλλήλοις ταῖς διαδοχαῖς γενόμενοι τὴν λεχθεῖσαν Ἰωνικὴν συμπληροῦσι φιλοσοφίαν ἀπὸ Θαλῆτος (these words conclude the list of the 'Ionian succession' of philosophers).

HIPPOLYTUS *Philosophumena* 5 : Diels *op. cit.* 559. 11. Δοκεῖ ἡμῖν τὴν ἀπὸ Πυθαγόρου ἐκθεμένους φιλοσοφίαν κατὰ διαδοχὴν ἀναδραμεῖν ἐπὶ τὰ δόξαντα τοῖς μετὰ Θαλῆν καὶ ταῦτα ἐξειπόντας ἐλθεῖν ἐπί τε τὴν ἠθικὴν καὶ λογικὴν φιλοσοφίαν, ὧν ἦρξαν Σωκράτης μὲν ἠθικῆς, Ἀριστοτέλης δὲ διαλεκτικῆς. The ancient histories of philosophy always recognised two 'successions' of early philosophers, an Ionian 'succession' from Thales and an Italian 'succession' from Pythagoras.

GALEN *Hist. Philos.* 3 : Diels *op. cit.* 599. 11. Τῶν δὲ Σωκρατικῶν πολλῶν γεγονότων ἔστι νῦν μόνον ποιήσασθαι μνήμην τῶν διαδοχὴν καταλελοιπότων. This seems to mean 'those who left behind them a succession' : he goes on to Plato, and enumerates the heads of the Academy.

PLUTARCH *de exilio* c. 14, 605 B. (After giving the list of Scholarchs in the Lyceum and the Stoa, he goes on) ὁ δὲ Ἀθηναῖος Ἀρχέδημος εἰς τὴν Παρθῶν μεταστὰς ἐν Βαβυλῶνι Στωικὴν διαδοχὴν ἀπέλιπε. That is, apparently, 'he started a succession of Stoic Scholarchs at Babylon.'

ii. Διαδοχή, διαδοχαί, for *books on the succession*, i.e. books on the history of philosophy, as giving the 'successions' in the different schools.

SOTION. Diogenes Laertius ii. § 12 Σωτίων μὲν γάρ φησιν ἐν τῇ Διαδοχῇ τῶν φιλοσόφων : *ibid.* prooem. § 1 καθά φησιν... Σωτίων ἐν τῷ εἰκοστῷ τρίτῳ τῆς Διαδοχῆς. For other reff. to Sotion in Diog. see index in Cobet's ed. Cf. Burnet, *Early Greek Philosophy* II. p. 425 : 'The first to write a work entitled Successions of the Philosophers was Sotion, about 200 B.C. The arrangement of his work is explained in [Diels'] *Doxographi* p. 147. It was epitomized by Herakleides Lembos. Other writers of Διαδοχαί were Antisthenes, Sosikrates and Alexander.' Diels *op. cit.* 147 f. believes that Heraclides' epitome of Sotion was the principal source of Hippolytus' account of the opinions of the philosophers in the *Philosophumena*.

ANTISTHENES (probably Antisthenes of Rhodes, about 200 B.C.: not of course the same as the founder of the Cynic school). Diog. Laert. II. § 98 καθά φησιν Ἀντισθένης ἐν φιλοσόφων διαδοχαῖς. For other references in Diog. see index in Cobet's ed.

SOSICRATES, *circa* 200—128 B.C. Athenaeus IV. 163 f. Σωσικράτης δ' ἐν τρίτῳ φιλοσόφων διαδοχῆς βαθεῖ πώγωνι χρήσασθαι τὸν Διόδωρον ἱστορεῖ κτλ.

ALEXANDER (that is, probably, Alexander Polyhistor, who was contemporary with Sulla). Diog. Laert. I. § 116 καθά φησιν Ἀλέξανδρος ἐν Διαδοχαῖς, II. § 19, II. § 106, etc. Diogenes himself seems to be mainly based upon this work: the list of references is given in the *Dictionary of Classical Biography* s.v. Alexander Lychnus, but, as stated above, he is probably not the right Alexander.

iii. Διάδοχος for *Successor*: in the sense, ultimately, of 'Head of the School in due succession.'

Anaximander: Diels *op. cit.* 476. 4, from Simplicius *in Phys.* Ἀναξίμανδρος Θαλοῦ γενόμενος διάδοχος καὶ μαθητής. The younger Zeno: Diels 469. 4, from Eusebius *P.E.* xv. 18 διάδοχον τῆς σχολῆς Ζήνωνα. Carneades: Diels 600. 1, from Galen *Hist. Philos.* τούτου δὲ Καρνεάδης κατέστη διάδοχος, i.e. head of the Academy after Arcesilaus. Proclus was called, to distinguish him from others of the same name, Proclus Diadochus, because he was head of the Academy and so successor of Plato.

C.I.L. III. 12283 gives an interesting series of documents of the year 121 A.D. in which the 'diadochus' of Epicurus at Athens obtains leave from Hadrian to make arrangements 'ad diadoches ordinationem,' so as to permit of others than Roman citizens being appointed to the succession: (1) The Empress Plotina to Hadrian; 'sectam Epicuri...huius successioni a te succurrendum...non licet nisi ex civibus Romanis adsumi diadochum...rogo nomine Popilli Theotimi qui est modo diadochus Athenis...ad diadoches ordinationem...substituere sibi successorem...et deinceps utantur futuri diadochi sectae Epicyri...circa electionem diadochi': (2) Hadrian to Theotimus; 'ad diadochen sectae Epicureae...facilius successorem electurus ...et deinceps ceteris qui diadochen habuerint': (3) Plotina to all concerned; συνκεχώρηται τῷ διαδόχῳ ὃς ἂν μέλλῃ τῆς Ἐπικούρου διαδοχῆς ἀφηγεῖσθαι τῆς οὔσης ἐν Ἀθήναις καὶ πᾶν τὸ πρὸς τὴν διαδοχὴν ἀνῆκον οἰκονόμημα Ἑλληνικῇ διαθήκῃ διατάσσεσθαι καὶ αἱρεῖσθαι εἴτε Ἕλληνα εἴτε Ῥωμαῖον βούλοιτο τὸν προστατήσοντα τῆς διαδοχῆς.

NOTE ON 'SUCCESSION' LANGUAGE IN THE EARLY CHRISTIAN WRITERS

CLEMENT OF ROME *ad Cor.* (c. A.D. 97) xliv. οἱ ἀπόστολοι...ἐπινομὴν δεδώκασιν ὅπως, ἐὰν κοιμηθῶσιν, διαδέξωνται ἕτεροι δεδοκιμασμένοι ἄνδρες τὴν λειτουργίαν αὐτῶν. [Quoted more fully on p. 111 *supra*.]

HEGESIPPUS *Hypomnemata* (c. A.D. 175). ap. Eus. *H.E.* ii. 23. 4 διαδέχεται τὴν ἐκκλησίαν μετὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων ὁ ἀδελφὸς τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰάκωβος. [See above, p. 120.] ap. Eus. *H.E.* iv. 22. 3

γενόμενος δὲ ἐν Ῥώμῃ διαδοχὴν ἐποιησάμην μέχρις Ἀνικήτου (οὗ διάκονος ἦν Ἐλεύθερος)· καὶ παρὰ Ἀνικήτου διαδέχεται Σωτήρ, μεθ' ὃν Ἐλεύθερος. ἐν ἑκάστῃ δὲ διαδοχῇ καὶ ἐν ἑκάστῃ πόλει οὕτως ἔχει ὡς ὁ νόμος κηρύσσει καὶ οἱ προφῆται καὶ ὁ Κύριος. [See pp. 117, 118.]

PTOLEMAEUS THE GNOSTIC *ep. ad Floram* (c. A.D. 175). ap. Epiphanius *Haer.* xxxiii. 7 μαθήσῃ γάρ, Θεοῦ διδόντος...ἀξιουμένη τῆς ἀποστολικῆς παραδόσεως, ἣν ἐκ διαδοχῆς καὶ ἡμεῖς παρειλήφαμεν μετὰ καὶ τοῦ κανονίσαι πάντας τοὺς λόγους τῇ τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν διδασκαλίᾳ. [See p. 116 note.]

IRENAEUS *adv. Haereses* (c. A.D. 185). I. xxvii. 1 (ap. Eus. *H.E.* iv. 11. 2) Κέρδων δέ τις...ἐπιδημήσας ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ ἐπὶ Ὑγίνου ἕνατον κλῆρον τῆς ἐπισκοπικῆς διαδοχῆς ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων ἔχοντος. III. ii. 2 'traditionem quae est ab apostolis, quae per successiones presbyterorum in ecclesiis custoditur': *ib.* iii. 1 'habemus adnumerare eos qui ab apostolis instituti sunt episcopi in ecclesiis et successores eorum usque ad nos...valde perfectos et inreprehensibiles in omnibus eos volebant esse quos et successores relinquebant, suum ipsorum locum magisterii tradentes ...sed quoniam valde longum est in hoc tali volumine omnium ecclesiarum enumerare successiones, maximae et antiquissimae et omnibus cognitae, a gloriosissimis duobus apostolis Petro et Paulo Romae fundatae et constitutae ecclesiae, eam quam habet ab apostolis traditionem et adnuntiatam hominibus fidem per successiones episcoporum pervenientem usque ad nos indicantes confundimus omnes': *ib.* iii. 3 (ap. Eus. *H.E.* v. 6. 1—4) διαδέχεται δὲ αὐτὸν [Λίνον] Ἀνέγκλητος...τὸν δὲ Κλήμεντα τοῦτον διαδέχεται Εὔαρεστος καὶ τὸν Εὔαρεστον Ἀλέξανδρος...Διαδεξαμένου τὸν Ἀνίκητον Σωτῆρος...Τῇ αὐτῇ τάξει καὶ τῇ αὐτῇ διαδοχῇ [Eus. διδαχῇ] ἥ τε ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ παράδυσις καὶ τὸ τῆς ἀληθείας κήρυγμα κατήντηκεν εἰς ἡμᾶς: *ib.* iii. 4 (ap. Eus. *H.E.* iv. 14. 5) μαρτυροῦσι τούτοις αἱ κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν ἐκκλησίαι πᾶσαι καὶ οἱ μέχρι νῦν διαδεδεγμένοι τὸν Πολύκαρπον. [See above, pp. 122—124.] IV. xxvi. 2 'quapropter eis qui in ecclesia sunt presbyteris oboedire oportet, his qui successionem habent ab apostolis...qui cum episcopatus successione charisma veritatis certum secundum placitum Patris acceperunt; reliquos vero qui absistunt a principali successione et quocumque loco colligunt suspectos habere': *ib.* xxvi. 5 'ubi igitur charismata Domini posita sunt, ibi discere oportet veritatem, apud quos est ea quae est ab apostolis ecclesiae successio.' [See above, p. 124.] IV. xxxiii. 8 (ap. *Sacra Parallela*) γνῶσις ἀληθὴς ἡ τῶν ἀποστόλων διδαχή, καὶ τὸ ἀρχαῖον τῆς ἐκκλησίας σύστημα κατὰ παντὸς τοῦ κόσμου, et character corporis Christi secundum successiones episcoporum quibus illi eam quae in unoquoque loco est ecclesiam tradiderunt.' [See above, pp. 126, 127.]

also of successions among heretics. II praef. 'progenitoris ipsorum doctrinam Simonis magi Samaritani et omnium eorum qui successerunt ei manifestavimus; diximus quoque multitudinem eorum qui sunt ab eo Gnostici, et differentias ipsorum et doctrinas et successiones adnotavimus': *ib.* ix. 2 'Simone mago primo...post deinde his qui successerunt ei': *ib.* xiv. 7 'ipsi homines...et discipuli ipsorum et horum successores.' I. xxvii. 1 διαδεξάμενος δὲ αὐτὸν [*sc.* Κέρδωνα] Μαρκίων ὁ Ποντικὸς ἠὔξησε τὸ διδασκαλεῖον. [So too the *Paschal Chronicle*, at the year 184, speaks of Theodotion of Pontus as ἀπὸ τῆς διαδοχῆς Μαρκίωνος: and see p. 202, l. 3 *infra*.]

CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA (c. A.D. 195). *Strom.* I. xiv. 64 ἡ διαδοχὴ τῶν παρ' Ἕλλησι φιλοσόφων. *ib.* I. i. 11 οἱ μὲν τὴν ἀληθῆ τῆς μακαρίας σώζοντες διδασκαλίας παράδοσιν εὐθὺς ἀπὸ Πέτρου τε καὶ Ἰακώβου Ἰωάννου τε καὶ Παύλου τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων, παῖς παρὰ πατρὸς ἐκδεχόμενος (ὀλίγοι δὲ οἱ πατράσιν ὅμοιοι) ἦκον δὴ σὺν Θεῷ καὶ εἰς ἡμᾶς τὰ προγονικὰ ἐκεῖνα καὶ ἀποστολικὰ καταθησόμενοι σπέρματα. [See above, pp. 49, 134.]

ANONYMUS *ad Avircium Marcellum* (c. A.D. 200). ap. Eus. *H.E.* v. 16. 7 παρὰ τὸ κατὰ παράδοσιν καὶ κατὰ διαδοχὴν ἄνωθεν τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἔθος δῆθεν προφητεύοντα. ap. Eus. *H.E.* v. 17. 4 εἰ γὰρ μετὰ Κοδρᾶτον καὶ τὴν ἐν Φιλαδελφίᾳ Ἀμμίαν, ὥς φασιν, αἱ περὶ Μοντανὸν διεδέξαντο γυναῖκες τὸ προφητικὸν χάρισμα, τοὺς ἀπὸ Μοντανοῦ καὶ τῶν γυναικῶν τίνες παρ' αὐτοῖς διεδέξαντο, δειξάτωσαν. δεῖν γὰρ εἶναι τὸ προφητικὸν χάρισμα ἐν πάσῃ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ μέχρι τῆς τελείας παρουσίας ὁ ἀπόστολος ἀξιοῖ.

SERAPION OF ANTIOCH (c. A.D. 200). ap. Eus. *H.E.* vi. 12. 6 παρ' ἄλλων τῶν ἀσκησάντων τοῦτο τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, τοῦτ' ἐστὶν παρὰ τῶν διαδόχων τῶν καταρξαμένων αὐτοῦ, οὓς Δοκητὰς καλοῦμεν.

TERTULLIAN *Praescr. adv. haer.* (c. A.D. 200) 32 'edant ergo origines ecclesiarum suarum, evolvant ordinem episcoporum suorum ita per successionem ab initio decurrentem ut primus ille episcopus aliquem ex apostolis (vel apostolicis viris—qui tamen cum apostolis perseveraverit) habuerit auctorem et antecessorem. hoc enim modo ecclesiae apostolicae census suos deferunt...exhibent quos ab apostolis in episcopatum constitutos apostolici seminis traduces habeant.' [See above, pp. 47, 128.] *adv. Marcionem* iv. 5 'constabit id esse ab apostolis traditum quod apud ecclesias apostolorum fuerit sacrosanctum...habemus et Ioannis alumnas ecclesias...ordo episcoporum ad originem recensus in Ioannem stabit auctorem. sic et ceterarum generositas recognoscitur...habet plane et illud ecclesias, sed suas, tam posteras quam adulteras, quarum si censum requiras, facilius apostaticum invenias quam apostolicum, Marcione scilicet conditore vel aliquo de Marcionis examine. faciunt favos et vespae, faciunt ecclesias et Marcionitae.' [Cf. pp. 128, 129.] See also another passage quoted above, p. 106, n. 1.

HIPPOLYTUS OF ROME. *Philosophumena* (c. A.D. 225) i. praef. οἱ ἀπόστολοι ... ὧν ἡμεῖς διάδοχοι. [More fully on p. 129.]

id. ix. 7 [of heretics at Rome] τοῦτον κατὰ διαδοχὴν διέμεινε τὸ δόγμα ἕως τοῦ καθ' ἡμᾶς χρόνου, ix. 12 τοῖς ἀποστόλοις Χριστοῦ διαδόχοις.

[ap. Eus. *H.E.* v. 28. 3 ἀπὸ τοῦ διαδόχου αὐτοῦ Ζεφυρίνου.]

ORIGEN. *de Principiis* (c. A.D. 230) i. praef. 2 'quoniam ergo multi ex his qui Christo credere se profitentur non solum in parvis et minimis discordant verum etiam in magnis et maximis...necessarium videtur prius de his singulis certam lineam manifestamque regulam ponere, tum deinde etiam de caeteris quaerere...cum multi sint qui se putant sentire quae Christi sunt et nonnulli eorum diversa a prioribus sentiant, servetur vero ecclesiastica praedicatio per successionis ordinem ab apostolis tradita et usque ad praesens in ecclesiis permanens, illa sola credenda est veritas quae in nullo ab ecclesiastica et apostolica discordat traditione.' [See pp. 50, 127.] *id.* iv. 9 ap. *Philoc.* i. 9 ἑλόμενος τοῦ καινὸς τῆς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ κατὰ διαδοχὴν τῶν ἀποστόλων οὐρανίου ἐκκλησίας. [See p. 50.]

FIRMILIAN OF CAESAREA (c. A.D. 256). ap. Cypr. *ep.* lxxv. 10 'potestas ergo peccatorum remittendorum apostolis data est et ecclesiis quas illi a Christo missi constituerunt, et episcopis qui eis ordinatione vicaria successerunt. hostes autem unius catholicae ecclesiae in quamvis sumus, et adversarii nostri qui apostolis successimus...quid aliud sunt quam Core et Dathan et Abiron?' [See above, p. 130.] *id.* 17 Stephen 'de episcopatus sui loco gloriatur et se successionem Petri tenere contendit...per successionem cathedram Petri habere se praedicat.'

CYPRIAN (c. A.D. 251—256). *ep.* xxxiii. 1 (he quotes Matth. xvi. 18, 19) 'inde per temporum et successionum vices episcoporum ordinatio et ecclesiae ratio decurrit, ut ecclesia super episcopos constituatur et omnis actus ecclesiae per eosdem praepositos gubernetur ...ecclesia in episcopo et clero et in omnibus stantibus sit constituta.' [See p. 130, n. 1.] *ep.* xlv. 3 'unitatem a Domino et per apostolos nobis successoribus traditam.' *ep.* lxvi. 4 'qui dicit ad apostolos et per hoc ad omnes praepositos qui apostolis vicaria ordinatione succedunt.' [See p. 130.] *ep.* lxix. 3 'si vero apud Cornelium fuit [ecclesia] qui Fabiano episcopo legitima ordinatione successit...Novatianus in ecclesia non est nec episcopus computari potest, qui evangelica et apostolica traditione contempta nemini succedens a se ipso ortus est.' *id.* 5 '"unus grex et unus pastor." si autem grex unus est, quomodo potest gregi adnumerari qui in numero gregis non est? aut pastor haberi quomodo potest qui, manente vero pastore et in ecclesia Dei ordinatione succedanea praesidente, nemini succedens et a se ipse incipiens alienus fit et profanus?' [See p. 143, n. 1.]

CLARUS OF MASCULA (A.D. 256). *Sent. Epp.* 79 'manifesta

est sententia Domini nostri Iesu Christi apostolos suos mittentis et ipsis solis potestatem a Patre sibi datam permittentis, quibus nos successimus eadem potestate ecclesiam Domini gubernantes.' [See p. 130.]

CORNELIUS OF ROME (A.D. 251). *ep. ad Fabium*, ap. Eus. *H.E.* vi. 43. 10 καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν δὲ ἐπισκόπων διαδόχους εἰς τοὺς τόπους, ἐν οἷς ἦσαν, χειροτονήσαντες ἀπεστάλκαμεν.

ANONYMUS (PSEUDO-CYPRIANUS) *de Aleatoribus* (cent. 3) 1 'in nobis divina et paterna pietas apostolatus ducatum contulit et vicariam Domini sedem caelesti dignatione ordinavit, et originem authentici apostolatus super quem Christus fundavit ecclesiam in superiore nostro portamus.'

EUSEBIUS OF CAESAREA *Historia Ecclesiastica.*

a. *of succession in the headship of a school* (see above, p. 133). *H.E.* vi. 29. 4 ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ...τῆς τῶν αὐτόθι κατηχήσεως τὴν διατριβὴν διαδέχεται Διονύσιος. *ib.* vii. 32. 6 [Anatolius of Laodicea] τῆς ἐπ' Ἀλεξανδρείας Ἀριστοτέλους διαδοχῆς τὴν διατριβὴν λόγος ἔχει πρὸς τῶν τῇδε πολιτῶν συστήσασθαι αὐτὸν ἀξιωθῆναι.

b. *of successive generations of Christians* (see p. 133). *H.E.* iii. 25. 6 ὧν οὐδὲν οὐδαμῶς ἐν συγγράμματι τῶν κατὰ τὰς διαδοχὰς ἐκκλησιαστικῶν τις ἀνὴρ εἰς μνήμην ἀγαγεῖν ἠξίωσεν. *ib.* vi. 9. 1 πολλὰ μὲν...ἐκ παραδόσεως τῶν κατὰ διαδοχὴν ἀδελφῶν τοῦ Ναρκίσσου μνημονεύουσιν. *ib.* vii. 19 τὸν γὰρ Ἰακώβου θρόνον...εἰς δεῦρο πεφυλαγμένον οἱ τῇδε κατὰ διαδοχὴν περιέποντες ἀδελφοὶ...ἐπιδείκνυνται.

c. *in particular, the sub-apostolic generation is 'the first succession from the apostles'* (see pp. 133, 134). *H.E.* ii. 23. 3 ὁ Ἡγήσιππος ἐπὶ τῆς πρώτης τῶν ἀποστόλων γενόμενος διαδοχῆς. *ib.* iii. 37. 1, 4 καὶ ἄλλοι δ' ἐπὶ τούτοις πλείους ἐγνωρίζοντο κατὰ τούσδε τὴν πρώτην τάξιν τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων ἐπέχοντες διαδοχῆς...ὅσοι ποτὲ κατὰ τὴν πρώτην τῶν ἀποστόλων διαδοχὴν ἐν ταῖς κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην ἐκκλησίαις γεγόνασιν ποιμένες ἢ καὶ εὐαγγελισταί. *ib.* v. 20. 1 συντάττεται τῷ Εἰρηναίῳ σπούδασμα ἐν ᾧ καὶ ἐπισημαίνεται τὴν πρώτην τῶν ἀποστόλων κατειληφέναι ἑαυτὸν διαδοχήν. *ib.* vi. 13. 8 [Clement of Alexandria] περὶ ἑαυτοῦ δηλοῖ ὡς ἔγγιστα τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων γενομένου διαδοχῆς (cf. v. 11. 2, also of Clement, τοὺς ἐμφανεστέρους ἧς κατείληφεν ἀποστολικῆς διαδοχῆς ἐπισημηνάμενος)

d. *of the apostolic succession of bishops, 'the successions'* par excellence (see p. 134 ff.). *H.E.* i. 1. 1, the opening words of the *History*, τὰς τῶν ἱερῶν ἀποστόλων διαδοχάς: expanded in i. 1. 4 ἀγαπῶντες, εἰ καὶ μὴ ἁπάντων, τῶν δ' οὖν μάλιστα διαφανεστάτων τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν ἀποστόλων τὰς διαδοχὰς κατὰ τὰς διαπρεπούσας ἔτι καὶ νῦν μνημονευομένας ἐκκλησίας ἀνασωσαίμεθα: *ib.* iii. 3. 3 προϊούσης δὲ τῆς ἱστορίας προύργου ποιήσομαι σὺν ταῖς διαδοχαῖς ὑποσημήνασθαι.... And similarly, at the break between the seventh and eighth books, vii. 32. 32 ἐν τούτοις τὴν τῶν διαδοχῶν

περιγράψαντες ὑπόθεσιν, ἀπὸ τῆς τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν γενέσεως ἐπὶ τὴν τῶν προσευκτηρίων καθαίρεσιν εἰς ἔτη συντείνουσαν πέντε καὶ τριακόσια... and viii. praef. τὴν τῶν ἀποστόλων διαδοχὴν ἐν ὅλοις ἑπτὰ περιγράψαντες βιβλίοις. *ib.* iii. 36. 2 Ἰγνάτιος τῆς κατὰ Ἀντιόχειαν Πέτρου διαδοχῆς δεύτερος τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν κεκληρωμένος. *ib.* v. 25 περὶ τῆς κατελθούσης εἰς αὐτοὺς ἐκ διαδοχῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων περὶ τοῦ πάσχα παραδόσεως.

e. *of the list or table of the successive bishops as 'the succession.'* *H.E.* v. 5. 9 οὗτος [Εἰρηναῖος] τῶν ἐπὶ Ῥώμης τὴν διαδοχὴν ἐπισκόπων...παραθέμενος, εἰς Ἐλεύθερον...τὸν κατάλογον ἵστησιν. *ib.* v. 12. 2 μεθ' ὃν ἐπισκοπεῦσαι Κασσιανὸν αἱ τῶν αὐτόθι διαδοχαὶ περιέχουσιν...καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶσι τὸν Νάρκισσον, τριακοστὸν ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων κατὰ τὴν τῶν ἑξῆς διαδοχὴν γεγενημένον.

f. *of the place in the list, of each unit in the series of bishops.* [pp. 136, 137.] *H.E.* iv. 1 Ἀλέξανδρος ἐπὶ Ῥώμης...πέμπτην ἀπὸ Πέτρου καὶ Παύλου κατάγων διαδοχὴν τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν ὑπολαμβάνει. *ib.* iv. 5. 2 μέχρι τῆς κατὰ Ἁδριανὸν Ἰουδαίων πολιορκίας πεντεκαίδεκα τὸν ἀριθμὸν αὐτόθι γεγόνασιν ἐπισκόπων διαδοχαί. *ib.* v. 12. 1 Νάρκισσος...πεντεκαιδεκάτην ἄγων διαδοχὴν ἀπὸ τῆς τῶν Ἰουδαίων κατὰ Ἁδριανὸν πολιορκίας.

It will be noticed how many instances of the less obvious uses of διαδοχή, διαδοχαί, relate to the church of Jerusalem.

For examples of διαδέχεσθαι and διάδοχος in Eus. see p. 136.

'ADAMANTII' *Dialogus de recta in Deum fide* (c. A.D. 330?) 1, ap. Orig. ed. Delarue i. 809, ΜΕΓΕΘΙΟΣ Μαρκίων ἐπίσκοπός μου ἦν. ΑΔΑΜΑΝΤΙΟΣ Ἐξ ὅτου Μαρκίων ἐτελεύτησεν τοσούτων ἐπισκόπων (μᾶλλον δὲ ψευδεπισκόπων) παρ' ὑμῖν διαδοχαὶ γεγόνασι· διὰ τί μὴ τῇ τῶν διαδόχων ἐπωνυμίᾳ κέκλησθε;

SERAPION OF THMUIS. *Sacramentarium* (c. A.D. 350) 14 ποίησον, ὁ Θεὸς τῆς ἀληθείας, καὶ τόνδε ἐπίσκοπον ζῶντα, ἐπίσκοπον ἅγιον [fortasse legendum ἄξιον] τῆς διαδοχῆς τῶν ἁγίων ἀποστόλων.

EPHREM SYRUS (editio Romana, Opp. Syrr. [1740] ii. 488) *adv. Haer. Serm.* xxiii. 'interrogentur' a quo manum susceperint... iam enim quilibet fiet sacerdos, dummodo suo ipse velit capiti manum imponere [God laid His hands on Moses, and so it comes down right through O.T., through John the Baptist to our Lord] ne videlicet ordo dissiparetur, quem etiam discipulis suis transcripsit et ab istis sibi transmissum hodie quoque nostra ecclesia retinet.'

LIBERIUS OF ROME *ep. ad Constantium* (c. A.D. 357) 'secutus morem ordinemque maiorum nihil addi episcopatui urbis Romae, nihil minui, passus sum: et illam fidem servans quae per successionem tantorum episcoporum cucurrit, ex quibus plures martyres extiterunt, inlibatam custodiri semper exopto.'

OPTATUS MILEVITANUS (c. A.D. 370) ii. 3, 4 'ergo cathedram unicam...sedit prior Petrus, cui successit Linus: Lino

successit Clemens [he goes on right through]...Liberio Damasus [Damaso Siricius]...cum quo nobis totus orbis commercio formatarum in una communionis societate concordat. vestrae cathedrae vos originem reddite, qui vobis vultis sanctam ecclesiam vindicare...fateatur socius vester Macrobius se ibi sedere ubi aliquando sedit Encolpius...ubi ante sedit Bonifacius Ballitanus...ubi sedit Victor Garbensis a vestris iamdudum de Africa missus...Victor erat ibi filius sine patre, tiro sine principe, discipulus sine magistro, sequens sine antecedente.'

AMBROSIASTER *Quaest. V. et N.T.* (c. A.D. 375) cx. 7 'eorum qui extra ecclesiam vel contra ecclesiam sedes sibi instituerunt cathedram "pestilentiae" esse dicimus...nam et ordinem ab apostolo Petro coeptum et usque ad hoc tempus per traducem succedentium episcoporum servatum perturbant, ordinem sibi sine origine vindicantes, hoc est corpus sine capite profitentes.'

EPIPHANIUS *Haer.* (c. A.D. 375) xxvii. 6 (in part possibly from Hegesippus) *ἐν χρόνοις Ἀνικήτου ἐπισκόπου Ῥώμης τοῦ μετὰ τὴν διαδοχὴν Πίου καὶ τῶν ἀνωτέρω...ἄλλοι τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν διεδέξαντο ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων...ὅμως ἡ τῶν ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἐπισκόπων διαδοχὴ ταύτην ἔχει τὴν ἀκολουθίαν· Πέτρος καὶ Παῦλος, Λίνος καὶ Κλῆτος, Κλήμης etc.*

GREGORY NAZIANZEN *Orat.* xxi. *In laudem S. Athanasii* (A.D. 379) 8 *ψήφῳ τοῦ λαοῦ παντὸς...ἀποστολικῶς δὲ καὶ πνευματικῶς ἐπὶ τὸν Μάρκου θρόνον ἀνάγεται, οὐχ ἧττον τῆς εὐσεβείας ἢ τῆς προεδρίας [ἐκείνου] διάδοχος· τῇ μὲν γὰρ πολλοστὸς ἀπ' ἐκείνου, τῇ δὲ εὐθὺς μετ' ἐκεῖνον εὑρίσκεται, ἣν δὴ καὶ κυρίως ὑπολεπτέον διαδοχήν. τὸ μὲν ὁμόγνωμον καὶ ὁμόθρονον, τὸ δὲ ἀντίδοξον καὶ ἀντίθρονον· καὶ ἡ μὲν προσηγορίαν ἡ δὲ ἀλήθειαν ἔχει διαδοχῆς. οὐ γὰρ ὁ βιασάμενος ἀλλ' ὁ βιασθεὶς διάδοχος, οὐδ' ὁ παρανομήσας ἀλλ' ὁ προβληθεὶς ἐννόμως, οὐδὲ ὁ ταὐαντία δοξάζων ἀλλ' ὁ τῆς αὐτῆς πίστεως· εἰ μὴ οὕτω τις λέγοι διάδοχον, ὡς νόσον ὑγιείας καὶ φωτὸς σκότος καὶ ζάλην γαλήνης καὶ συνέσεως ἔκστασιν.*

JEROME *ep.* xli. (c. A.D. 384) 3 'apud nos apostolorum locum episcopi tenent.' *ep.* cxlvi. (c. A.D. 400?) 1 'ubicumque fuerit episcopus, sive Romae sive Eugubii sive Constantinopoli sive Rhegii sive Alexandriae sive Tanis, eiusdem meriti, eiusdem est sacerdotii...omnes apostolorum successores sunt.' Cf. also *ep.* xiv. 8.

VITA PACHOMII (*Acta SS.* Mai. iii. p. 29*: c. A.D. 400?) 18 *ὑποτάσσεσθαι δὲ ἐπιεικῶς τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ καλόν, καὶ ὃν εὕρομεν κατὰ καιρὸν ὑπὸ τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν τῶν ἐπισκόπων κατασταθέντα, ἔχειν αὐτὸν λειτουργὸν τῆς ἱερατείας ταύτης...καί τινα ὁμοίως ἐν μέμψει ὡς ἄνθρωπον γενόμενον, οὐ κρίνομεν αὐτόν· καὶ γὰρ Θεὸς κριτὴς ὢν ὑφ' ἑαυτὸν ἔχει τοὺς κατὰ καιρὸν κριτάς, τοὺς διαδόχους τῶν ἀποστόλων, δυναμένους τῷ πνεύματι κρῖναι δικαίαν κρίσιν.*

SYNESIUS OF PTOLEMAIS *ep.* lxvi. (c. A.D. 411) *ad Theophilum τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ ἐρώτημα πρὸς ὃ δεῖ τὴν αὐθεντίαν τῆς Εὐαγγελικῆς Διαδοχῆς* [i.e. the successor of St Mark] *ἀποκρίνασθαι.*

AUGUSTINE *contra Cresconium Donatistam* (c. A.D. 406) iii. 18 (21) 'post episcopos ab ipsis apostolorum sedibus inconcussam seriem usque in haec tempora perducentes non unum hominem non unam domum non unam civitatem non unam gentem sed orbem terrarum rebaptizandum esse censetis.'

ep. liii. (c. A.D. 400) 1—4 'Donatistarum presbyter...ordinem Christianitatis civitatis vestrae tibi ut insinuaret, iussisse sibi angelum scripsit; cum tu teneas Christianitatem non civitatis tuae tantum nec tantum Africae vel Afrorum sed totius orbis terrae...si tibi angelus de caelo diceret "dimitte Christianitatem orbis terrae et tene partis Donati, cuius ordo tibi exponitur in epistula episcopi tuae civitatis," anathema esse deberet...si enim ordo episcoporum sibi succedentium considerandus est, quanto certius et vere salubriter ab ipso Petro numeramus, cui totius ecclesiae figuram gerenti Dominus ait [he quotes Matth. xvi. 18], Petro enim successit Linus [he goes through the whole catalogue] Damaso Siricius, Siricio Anastasius. in hoc ordine successionis nullus Donatista episcopus invenitur...in illum autem ordinem episcoporum qui dicitur ab ipso Petro usque ad Anastasium, qui nunc eandem cathedram sedet, etiam si quisquam traditor per illa tempora subrepsisset, nihil praeiudicaret ecclesiae et innocentibus christianis...isti dissipati sunt qui legunt in codicibus sanctis ecclesias quibus apostoli scripserunt, et nullum in eis habent episcopum...ne sibi etiam de Constantinensi, hoc est civitatis vestrae, episcoporum ordine blandiatur, recita illi gesta...quibus liquido constitit ita Paulum episcopum tradidisse ut Silvanus tunc eius subdiaconus fuerit et cum illo tradiderit.' *ib.* 6 'nos non tam de istis documentis praesumamus quam de scripturis sanctis.' [See p. 193.]

CELESTINE OF ROME *ep. ad concilium Ephesinum* (A.D. 431): 'Sanctum namque est pro debita sibi veneratione collegium in quo utique nunc apostolorum frequentissimae illius congregationis aspicienda reverentia est...haec ad omnes in commune Domini sacerdotes mandatae praedicationis cura pervenit; haereditario in hanc sollicitudinem iure constringimur quicumque per diversa terrarum eorum [*sc.* the Apostles] vice nomen Domini praedicamus...necesse est ut competenter nostros sequamur auctores; subeamus omnes eorum labores quibus omnes successimus in honore...agendum igitur est labore communi ut commissa et per apostolicam successionem hucusque detenta servemus[1].'

[1] Labbe-Coleti *Concilia* III. 1143 Mansi IV. 1283: in the Greek version read at the council (and printed in the editions in parallel columns to the Latin original) the crucial phrases run thus: *τῇ ἐκείνων διαδοχῇ τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου κηρύττοντες...οἱ τὴν τούτων διαδεξάμενοι τιμὴν...τὰ ἐμπιστευθέντα καὶ διὰ τῆς ἀποστολικῆς διαδοχῆς ἕως τοῦ νῦν συσχεθέντα φυλάξωμεν.*

NOTE ON THE CHRONOLOGY OF HEGESIPPUS

See pp. 115—120.

Eusebius, as he is almost our sole authority for the matter of Hegesippus, so is our sole authority for the date: and with the whole *Hypomnemata* at his disposal he may have had more reasons than he actually gives for assigning to Hegesippus his proper chronological position. But one rather gets the impression that the date is progressively modified from one passage to another of the *History*. When he is first quoted (*H.E.* II. 23. 3), he is described as ἐπὶ τῆς πρώτης τῶν ἀποστόλων γενόμενος διαδοχῆς—on this use of διαδοχή see p. 203 c.: in IV. 8. 2 he is cited in connexion with a passage about the games in honour of Hadrian's favourite Antinous ὁ ἐφ' ἡμῶν γενόμενος, and is placed in near company with Justin Martyr, at about the transition from the reign of Hadrian to the reign of Pius (A.D. 138): in IV. 11. 7 passing mention is made of him in connexion with pope Anicetus, under whom he arrived in Rome: in IV. 21, in the reign of M. Aurelius, he is put at the head of a string of orthodox writers whose *floruit* belonged say to the decade 170—180 A.D., Dionysius of Corinth, Apollinaris, Melito etc., and 'above all' Irenaeus. This last synchronism is no doubt based on the publication of his book under Eleutherus, and must be taken as Eusebius' matured opinion. Now even if the publication belonged to the first years of Eleutherus, not later than 175, and even if Hegesippus was then quite an old man, he cannot have belonged literally to the 'first generation from the apostles,' that is the sub-apostolic age. Nor can we press his own synchronism with Antinous, ἐφ' ἡμῶν, to mean more than that their lives over-lapped, seeing that Irenaeus can say of the vision of the Apocalypse that it was seen at the end of Domitian's reign σχεδὸν ἐπὶ τῆς ἡμετέρας γενεᾶς (*Haer.* v. xxx. 3), though Irenaeus was not born till some thirty years after Domitian's death. Lastly it is not likely that Hegesippus would have brought his Golden Age down as late as the commencement of Trajan's time if his own life went back so far, for the Golden Age always belongs to a rather remote background. On the other hand he cannot have reached Rome after 165 at the latest, and he was then a full-grown theologian. Putting both sets of *data* together, we may conclude with some security that his birth falls within the reign of Hadrian 117—138 A.D., and probably in the earlier rather than in the later part of it.

NOTE ON THE MEANING OF ΧΕΙΡΟΘΕΤΟΥΜΕΝΟΥΣ IN THE 8TH CANON OF NICAEA

See pp. 176, 177.

A discussion of the respective histories of χειροθεσία and χειροτονία, with their cognates, is a great *desideratum*, but it cannot be attempted in this note. It would probably be found, as the result of such an investigation, that the two words in process of time became more sharply distinguished from one another than they had been at the first. In other words, it is more likely that χειροθετεῖν might mean 'to ordain' in the year 325, than in the year 375 (or still more 425 or 525) when χειροθετεῖν was coming to be used specially of imposition of hands in other rites than ordination, for which latter χειροτονεῖν was reserved. The scope of this note is therefore limited to the citation of some early passages which appear to depend directly on the eighth canon of Nicaea.

1. JEROME *Dial. adv. Luciferianos* 26: 'synodus quoque Nicaena...omnes haereticos suscepit, exceptis Pauli Samosateni discipulis; et quod his maius est, episcopo Novatianorum, si conversus fuerit, presbyterii gradum servat.' The statement about baptism is an inaccurate one, even for Jerome: the statement about orders is concerned rather with the fact that an ex-schismatic cleric was permitted to exercise clerical functions (which was what Lucifer would not permit) than with the conditions with which the permission was hedged. That is to say, Jerome does not in terms assert that χειροθετουμένους means anything but 'ordained'—though he may have wished it to be understood that it meant something else.

2. THEOPHILUS OF ALEXANDRIA in his Canons (printed e.g. in Beveridge's *Synodicon* ii. 174) substitutes in his paraphrase of the Nicene decision the word χειροτονουμένους. Clearly he understood reordination to be meant: ἐπειδὴ τοίνυν ἡ μεγάλη σύνοδος ἡ γενομένη ἐν Νικαίᾳ παρὰ τῶν μακαρίων πατέρων ἡμῶν ὥρισεν ὥστε χειροτονεῖσθαι τοὺς προσερχομένους, θέλησον κατὰ τὸν τύπον τοῦτον τοὺς ἐθέλοντας προσέρχεσθαι τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ χειροτονεῖν, εἴ γε ὁ βιὸς αὐτῶν ὀρθός ἐστι καὶ μηδὲν τούτοις ἀντίκειται.

3. INNOCENT OF ROME *ep.* xxii. § 5 (see Labbe-Coleti *Concilia* III. 34, Mansi III. 1061), writing to the bishops of Macedonia against the re-admission to clerical office of clerical converts from heresy, meets the difficulty raised on the score of the eighth canon of Nicaea by arguing that an exceptional privilege was there granted to the Novatianists which it was never intended should apply to other sectaries: '"sed canones apud Nicaeam constituti de Novatianis fieri

permiserunt." prius ille canon a patribus institutus ponendus est, ut possimus advertere vel quid vel qualiter ab eisdem sensum sit vel praeceptum: "de his" inquit "qui nominant se ipsos Catharos (id est mundos) et aliquando veniunt ad catholicam ecclesiam, placuit sanctae et magnae synodo ut accepta manus inpositione sic maneant in clero." possum vero dicere de solis hoc Novatianis esse praeceptum nec ad aliarum haeresum clericos pertinere: nam si utique de omnibus ita definirent, addidissent "a Novatianis aliisque haereticis" revertentes debere in suum ordinem recipi.' As the pope renders the ambiguous χειροθετουμένους quite literally 'accepta manus inpositione,' it is not so far clear whether he is thinking of benediction or ordination. But as in an earlier passage of the same letter (§ 3) he appears to agree that heretical ordination is null, 'quod non habuit dare non potuit,' it would follow that it could only be by catholic ordination that the ex-heretic could be qualified to minister at all. And this was just the idea on which the Macedonian bishops had acted, 'ut quos Bonosus ordinaverat...ordinati reciperentur.'[1]

4. The LATIN VERSIONS OF THE NICENE CANONS[2] may be divided, as regards their evidence on this point, into three classes. (*a*) Those that translate so literally as to reproduce the ambiguity of the Greek, 'manu eis inposita' (Gallica), 'inpositionem manus accipientes' (Dionysius Exiguus). (*b*) Those that while speaking of the 'imposition of hands' make it clear one way or another whether they understand the laying on of hands to be that of reconciliation or that of ordination. The version of Caecilian of Carthage (one of the few Western bishops present at Nicaea) is alone in adopting the former sense; it introduces later in the canon the words 'inpositis manibus reconciliationis.'[3] The primitive Italian version known as Ingilram's interprets the ambiguity by another insertion in the opposite sense, 'reordinati ab episcopo ecclesiae catholicae,' and so quite similarly the Gallo-Hispana with 'accepta ordinatione.' (*c*) Those that boldly render χειροθετουμένους 'ordained.' So Atticus 'eos ordinatos sic manere in clero,' the Isidorian 'ut ordinentur et sic maneant in clero,' and Rufinus 'in ordine quidem suo suscipi debere, sed ordinatione data.' Thus the Western canonists of the fourth and fifth centuries are all but unanimous in the sense which they give to the prescription of the canon.

[1] So Morinus *de sacris Ordinationibus* pars III. exercitatio v. de ordinationum iteratione, cap. xii. § 15.

[2] See my *Ecclesiae Occidentalis Monumenta Iuris Antiquissima* I. 122—125, 202—205, 262, 263.

[3] If Caecilian brought the canons back from Nicaea in their Greek form, it was possibly not till 419 that they were turned into Latin, and by that time the influence of St Augustine had presumably fixed the attitude of the African Church on the subject.

5. The QUAESTIONES ET RESPONSIONES AD ORTHODOXOS, which passed under the name of Justin Martyr, are by modern critics referred to an origin in the Antiochene School and a date not far removed from A.D. 400: Harnack (*Texte und Untersuchungen* N. F. vi. 4) claimed them for Diodore of Tarsus, but that is perhaps too early. · *Quaest.* xiv. (*S. Justini Opera* Paris 1742, p. 446): ΕΡΩΤΗCIC. Εἰ ἐψευσμένον τυγχάνει καὶ μάταιον τὸ ὑπὸ τῶν αἱρετικῶν διδόμενον βάπτισμα, διὰ τί οἱ ὀρθόδοξοι τὸν προσφεύγοντα τῇ ὀρθοδοξίᾳ αἱρετικὸν οὐ βαπτίζουσιν ἀλλ', ὡς ἐν ἀληθεῖ, τῷ νόθῳ ἐῶσι βαπτίσματι; εἰ δὲ καὶ χειροτονίαν τύχοι παρ' ἐκείνων δεξάμενος, καὶ ταύτην ὡς βεβαίαν αὐτοὶ ἀποδέχονται· πῶς οὖν ὁ δεχθεὶς καὶ οἱ δεξάμενοι τὸ ἄμεμπτον ἔχουσιν; ΑΠΟΚΡΙCIC. Τοῦ αἱρετικοῦ ἐπὶ τὴν ὀρθοδοξίαν ἐρχομένου τὸ σφάλμα διορθοῦται· τῆς μὲν κακοδοξίας τῇ μεταθέσει τοῦ φρονήματος, τοῦ δὲ βαπτίσματος τῇ ἐπιχρίσει τοῦ ἁγίου μύρου, τῆς δὲ χειροτονίας τῇ χειροθεσίᾳ· καὶ οὐδὲν τῶν πάλαι μένει ἄλυτον.

This passage has been included here among the commentaries on the eighth canon of Nicaea because that is, I believe, the source of the reference to χειροθεσία. Unfortunately some of the ambiguity of the original clings to the citation. On the one side the two arguments, (1) that a new confirmation, ἐπίχρισις, was required from the convert, and (2) that it is definitely denied that the previous ordination did stand as it was, οὐδὲν...μένει ἄλυτον, suggest that the author of the treatise believed that, in accordance with the Nicene canon, another rite, additional to confirmation and therefore in effect indistinguishable from a new ordination, did in the case of the clergy follow. Nothing short of this could be described as 'a dissolution of existing conditions.' On the other side would be the fact that the case of baptism appears to be put parallel with the case of ordination, and the baptism itself is recognized. Moreover Severus of Antioch, if his language is to be construed strictly, recognizes the ordination of some sects whose confirmation he did not recognize; see below p. 213. Severus however is a century later than the presumed date of the *Quaestiones et Responsiones*: and the interpretation of the latter treatise on this point must be left open.

6. The ACTS OF THE SECOND COUNCIL OF NICAEA are alluded to on p. 177 *supra*.

But if it were clear that χειροθετουμένους did not mean 'ordained,' I should then interpret it 'confirmed'; for that is the sense in which St Firmilian uses 'manum inponere' (=χειροθετεῖν or χεῖρας ἐπιθεῖναι), see p. 161 *supra*. 'As to Novatianists we recognize their baptism (but of course it must be completed by confirmation) and we are willing to let them stand in their original rank in the clergy.' This would *imply* reordination.

NOTE ON THE LETTERS OF SEVERUS

See pp. 172, 190.

The extent to which the practice (as apart from the theological grounds on which it was based) of St Augustine, and those who followed him in the recognition of the validity of non-Catholic sacraments, found as time went on its counterpart in the East may be illustrated from the letters of Severus, the great Monophysite patriarch of Antioch. The date of Severus—he was patriarch from 512 till 518, and lived in Egypt for another twenty years after his ejection from his see—excludes his writings from consideration in the text: and indeed it is not likely that in the time of St Augustine, a hundred years before Severus, any Eastern theologian would have gone anything like as far as Severus goes in the Augustinian direction. But the situation, with its practical difficulties as between Chalcedonians (Diphysites, as the other side called them) and Monophysites was not unlike that which had existed in Africa between Catholics and Donatists—an issue long doubtful, in which the preponderance swung now to one side now to the other, with a strong desire on the part of the cooler heads in both parties to make the way of return for their opponents as easy as could be. All this is photographed for us, so to say, in the correspondence of the Monophysite leader, or rather in the fragments of it that are happily preserved to us.

Severus was of course a Greek, and wrote in Greek: but the linguistic boundary came soon to be the confessional boundary as well so that Greeks were Chalcedonian, while Copts and Western Syrians were Monophysite. Thus it was through translation into Syriac that the works of Severus, like nearly all else of the extant literature from the early period of the Monophysite movement, have survived. It is reckoned that the twenty-three books known to have existed of his collected letters must have contained not less than some 4000 items: but what we have in our hands is no more than 123 letters, forming one book of an edition of selections. The selected edition appears itself to have been Greek: the Syriac version of its sixth book was made in A.D. 669 and is preserved in two British Museum MSS., Add. 12181 and 14600, of the eighth century, and it is this which has in recent years been edited and translated by Mr E. W. Brooks (*Text and Translation Society*, London, 1902—1904). The warmest gratitude of all students of Church history is due to Mr Brooks for having made available for their use, in so scholarly a form, a new and valuable source of information for the ecclesiastical affairs of the East in the first half of the sixth century.

The letters are for the most part on matters of discipline and especially on the discipline of the sacraments, and contain a good many references to the treatment of Baptism, Confirmation, and Orders, conferred outside the Church—which to Severus of course meant outside the Monophysite communion. The fifth of the eleven classes in which the letters are grouped is headed 'About clergymen or laymen who are converted from heresies': and one long letter in the first class (I. 60: Brooks, pp. 179—191) bears also on our problem.

Severus, unlike Augustine, is remarkably well posted in the history of the subject from St Cyprian onwards. He both admits and justifies the fact of a progressive developement in the attitude of Christians towards the sacraments of other Christian bodies alien to themselves. There is indeed no validity in any acts done by heretics: but just as the Holy Spirit came upon the messengers of Saul when they came near to the church of the prophets, so now the same Spirit in the glorious and orthodox Church of Christ works His wonders upon those who forsake their heresy and join it[1]. And the rulers of the Church have been from generation to generation divinely inspired in the modifications they have introduced, as different heresies have successively arisen, into the methods of receiving converts from them—some by baptism, others by chrism (confirmation), others on mere anathema of the heresy they have abandoned. Thus Cyprian ordered all to be rebaptized: the council of Nicaea ordered none to be rebaptized but those who like the 'Paulianists' (the followers of Paul of Samosata) do not confess the three hypostases in the Godhead: Arians, Macedonians, Novatianists, Photinians, are received with chrism only: Nestorians after simply anathematizing their former error[2]. These differences rest in part on the more fundamentally unchristian character of the earlier heresies, but not entirely, since for example the doctrine of Photinus is not easily distinguishable from that of Paul of Samosata[3]. Our only safe rule is to follow the code which has gradually grown up; the principle which we can discern underlying it is simply the greater good of the whole, and this is not always to be obtained by the same means[4]. 'Each conclusion has its own validity in the case of those with reference to whom it was introduced': 'these things are rather matters of politic administration': 'we must distinguish between times, and look into them, and consider what ought to be required in the case of general unions': 'their one purpose was the salvation of those who had perished': 'we ought not to block the lawful path of penitence...let us show ourselves mild to our fellow-servants, inasmuch as we also are in need of mildness at the day of judgment.'[5]

[1] Brooks, vol. II (translation), pp. 183—185.
[2] *ib.* pp. 296, 297: 298, 312, 348: 300, 352.
[3] *ib.* pp. 298—301.
[4] *ib.* p. 297.
[5] *ib.* pp. 301, 305, 285, 280, 322.

Severus has points of contact with Augustine not only in this spirit of leniency towards converts but also on the specific problem of the relation between heretical baptism and heretical orders. While the prevalent tendency in the Eastern Church had been (at any rate during the fourth century) to distinguish between the two sacraments, and to recognize the one but to reject the other, Severus and Augustine agree in making no distinction between the two. This is the more noticeable in the case of Severus, because he admits that baptism and confirmation or chrism do not necessarily go together: converts from some sects are in fact, according to his view, received with chrism[1]. But he is here only carrying out his oft-repeated principle of following the traditional code of rules: the code did not (he would say) lay down any similar rules about holy orders, and he was therefore free to follow his own inclination or interpretation. 'No canon or precept directs that those who have been converted from the heresy of the Nestorians should receive ordination afresh. If they received ordination afresh, then those also who were baptized by the same heresy would always be baptized afresh.' 'The statute is that converts should be re-ordained when they come from the same heresies from which when men come over to piety (after having received a spurious baptism from them) they are perfected by the true baptism.' 'Shew us that men who come from the heresy of Diphysitism, that is of the Nestorians, ought to be rebaptized, in order that we may be compelled to insist upon reordination also.'[2]

By the 'Nestorians' Severus means of course the orthodox or Chalcedonian party: he regarded himself and his friends as holding the royal road of the true faith between the errors of Nestorius and Leo on the one side and of Eutyches and Julian of Halicarnassus on the other. As regards the Nestorian-Diphysite (in our language, the Catholic) communion he never wavers in his assertion that their baptism, their chrism, and their orders are alike valid: nothing can properly be required of them beyond a definite renunciation of their heresy. He admits that, in the tension and confusion of the first years after the council of Chalcedon in 451, stricter views had been advocated and acted on: some rebaptized converts, some reordained them, and repetition of chrism was common enough for Severus to label it 'the self-created religion of the Re-anointers.'[3] But from

[1] And so the odd result followed, that an Arian presbyter would have been re-confirmed but not re-ordained. Such a system can never have existed in actual practice: the heresies to which reception by chrism applied were extinct in Severus' time and place, so that he probably never came face to face with such a *reductio ad absurdum* of his own position.

[2] Brooks pp. 180, 302, 304.

[3] *ib.* p. 185. In regard to these unfortunate members of his own Church, Severus goes back upon his principles, and while he will not

the first the leaders had taken the correct course: 'Timothy of saintly memory'—i.e. Timothy Aelurus of Alexandria—in spite of the ardour of the people, who would not tolerate any who had been ordained by Proterius, 'received those who came from the heresy of the Diphysites in the rank in which they were, bishops I mean and presbyters and deacons, upon their anathematizing the heresy itself in writing, and accepting such a period of separation for penitence only as he judged and determined to be good.'[1]

Thus the same conclusion in effect was reached by Augustine and Severus, though by very different routes. Both wanted, from motives of charity and statesmanship alike, to attract converts by not insisting on more than the minimum of necessary terms: but the keynote to Severus' position is the conception of a gradual amelioration of the terms of admission, dictated in part no doubt by the less fundamental character of the more recent heresies, in part by genuine moderation, in part also by the unconscious tendency to regard these measures of ecclesiastical policy as moves in a game directed to the embarrassment and ultimate checkmate of opponents. On the other hand the essential meaning of St Augustine's doctrine on the subject is to be looked for in his desire to put the theology of the sacraments in relation to the Church on a basis at once logical and ethical. The acceptance of the baptism of heretics and schismatics led logically to the acceptance of their orders: the ethical basis he found in the stress on the connexion of charity with unity.

reject their baptism goes very near to a rejection of their orders ('those who received the name of clergymen from Gregory the follower of Theodotus the Re-anointer must in all points and by all means be reckoned among laymen,' p. 418)—another proof that in the East it was the numbers and importance of a sect which most largely influenced the attitude adopted towards its sacraments and especially its orders.

[1] Brooks p. 181: cf. p. 305.

ESSAY IV

THE CYPRIANIC DOCTRINE OF THE MINISTRY

JOHN HENRY BERNARD, D.D., D.C.L.
ARCHBISHOP OF DUBLIN

SUMMARY

I. The Church of Carthage; its origin and growth.

II. The witness of Tertullian to its organization:
- His distinction between layman and priest.
- The threefold order of the ministry.

III. Cyprian's training for his office.

IV. The episcopal office in Cyprian's writings:
- His use of sacrificial terms.
- The Eucharistic language of the early Church.
- The bishop's office a sacrificial one.
  - Analogy of Hebrew priesthood.
- The bishop's office one of intercession.
- The teaching office of a bishop.
- Method of episcopal elections.
- Unworthy bishops to be restrained.

V. The presbyteral office, at Carthage and at Rome:
- The evolution of the presbyterate.
- The presbyter as the bishop's delegate.

VI. The monarchical episcopate:
- Independence of each bishop.
- Councils of bishops.

VII. The treatise *De unitate*:
- Its occasion.
- Its argument.
- Cyprian on the Roman see.
- The interpolation in the *De unitate*.
- The unity of the collective episcopate.

VIII. The Baptismal Controversy:
- The minister of baptism.
- Heretical baptism disavowed in the East.
- The laxer practice of Rome.
- Cyprian's arguments against validity of heretical baptism.
- For him what is irregular is invalid.
- His charity wider than his logic

IX. Conclusion.

IV

THE CYPRIANIC DOCTRINE OF THE MINISTRY

I

The beginnings of the Church of Carthage are obscure, and the history of its developement before the middle of the third century depends upon inference rather than upon direct tradition. The secular history of the city tells us little that can help to determine the source from which its Christianity was derived, except in so far as its long connexion with Rome may suggest that it was thence that the Gospel came to proconsular Africa.

Some twenty years after the destruction of Carthage by Scipio in the second century before Christ, it was rebuilt by its conquerors, and an attempt was made to establish a Roman colony. This was not successful, and the revival of Roman favour may be said to begin with the reign of Augustus. In his day many Romans settled there, and it rapidly became a great metropolis, enjoying the patronage of successive emperors, Hadrian and the Antonines doing much to increase its prosperity. Latin became the official language, and the ancient Punic speech, which maintained itself in other cities in North Africa, was spoken by few, even of the lower classes, in Carthage. At the end of the second century, the language of the Carthaginian Christians was Latin, and of ecclesiastical Latin we have the earliest example in the writings of Tertullian.

It is natural to suppose that the Christianity of Carthage came from Rome, whence so much of her learning, her wealth, and her civilization sprang; but there is no direct evidence of this[1]. Nor does Tertullian, Cyprian, or Augustine give any hint that the Christian faith came to North Africa by way of Italy, although, if that had been believed by any of these writers or by their controversial opponents, it could hardly have failed to appear in their discussions about the seat of authority in religion. Augustine, indeed, seems to suggest that the Gospel reached Africa from the East[2]. A great port like Carthage, whither merchandise came from all parts of the world, was in constant communication with Antioch and Alexandria, and it may well be that the knowledge of the Christian faith was brought thither by some chance traveller in the first instance. That the language of the Carthaginian Church should be Latin was inevitable; but it is noteworthy that its earlier literary remains, such as the Passion of Perpetua, were almost immediately translated into Greek.

It has been suggested[3] that as at Rome, so at Carthage the first converts were found among the Jewish colonists, who formed an important section of the community. Among St Peter's hearers on the Day of Pentecost were some from 'the parts of Libya about Cyrene[4],' and it may be that his message was carried back to Carthage and its neighbourhood. But

[1] Lightfoot, indeed, writes that 'Africa was evangelized from Rome,' but he does not produce proofs and admits that 'of the African Church before the close of the second century ... we know absolutely nothing' (*Philippians* p. 222 [224]).

[2] Pars autem Donati ... non considerat ... ab illa radice orientalium ecclesiarum se esse praecisam, unde euangelium in Africam uenit (*Ep.* LII 2).

[3] See H. Leclercq *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne* s.v. 'Carthage' col. 2206. He points out that in the ancient cemeteries of Carthage Jews and Christians are buried side by side.

[4] Acts ii 10.

we have no direct evidence, nor have we any trustworthy tradition which would support such a conjecture. It is noteworthy that an apostolic foundation was never claimed for the Churches of North Africa during the controversies of the third and fourth centuries. Tertullian argues, 'We have communion with the Apostolic Churches, because we have no doctrine differing from theirs[1],' not—it will be observed—because the Churches of Africa were themselves apostolic.

Such being the dearth of evidence, we can say nothing positively about the origins of the North African Church. We find it widely spread and firmly established by the end of the second century, and in possession of a complete organization. Of the beginnings of that organization we know nothing. As early as the year 180 we read of martyrdoms, and the Acts of the Scillitan Martyrs remain to shew not only that some African Christians of the humbler classes were ready to die for their religion, but that the Christians were even then so considerable a body that the imperial government found it worth while to suppress them by force[2]. Throughout the writings of Tertullian, that is, during the first twenty years of the third century, martyrdom is a principal theme; his earliest extant treatise is addressed *ad martyras*, to confessors for the faith who were then in prison, and for whose bodily and spiritual needs careful provision was made by their brethren who were as yet free. Among much that is uncertain, as to their numbers and as to the motives which prompted their

[1] *De praescr.* 21.

[2] Recent excavations have revealed the names of *Felicitas*, *Saturus*, *Reuocatus*, upon sepulchral remains in the 'Basilica maiorum' which was the centre of Christian life at Carthage; and it is claimed by the discoverers that here we have the authentic resting-place of the famous martyr St Perpetua and her companions (*Dict. d'arch. chrét.* s.v. 'Carthage' col. 2239). Perpetua's martyrdom was in 202.

persecution, it remains clear that the story of the martyrs of North Africa in the second and third centuries presupposes a vigorous Christian faith, widely held and well reasoned out. The well-known boast of Tertullian was grounded in fact: 'We are a people of yesterday, and yet we have filled every place belonging to you, cities, islands, outposts, towns, district-centres, your very camp, your tribes, the civil service, the palace, the senate, the forum. We leave you your temples only[1].' This was written in the year 197. Fifteen years later, the same enthusiastic apologist declares that if all the Christians in Carthage are to be put to death, the population of the city will be 'decimated'; and he even goes so far as to claim, in another passage, that his fellow-believers 'almost form a majority in every city[2].' Such statements breathe the spirit of the orator rather than of the historian, but they are sufficient to establish the vigour and vitality of the Christian communities for whom Tertullian was spokesman.

An independent testimony may be seen in the fact that at the First Council of Carthage, which was held between the years 213 and 220, no less than seventy[3] bishops were assembled under the presidency of Agrippinus. We have here an indication, at the least, of a Christian Society of wide extent and sufficiently long established to possess a definite organization[4].

[1] Hesterni sumus, et uestra omnia impleuimus, urbes, insulas, castella, municipia, conciliabula, castra ipsa, tribus, decurias, palatium, senatum, forum; sola uobis reliquimus templa (*Apol.* 37).

[2] *Ad Scapulam* 5 and 2.

[3] Aug. *de unic. bapt. c. Petil.* XIII 22; cp. Cypr. *Epp.* LXXI 4, LXXIII 3.

[4] It is argued by Leclercq in Cabrol's *Dict. d'arch. chrét.* II 2290 that the Churches of North Africa were sufficiently organized by the year 180 to possess archives where books and official documents were preserved, because the proconsul asks the Scillitan Martyrs 'Quae sunt res in capsa uestra?' to which they reply 'Libri et epistulae Pauli.' This may be a just inference, but *capsa* might equally well mean a box which contained the personal possessions of the martyrs addressed.

II

What was the nature of this organization? The allusions of Tertullian leave us in no doubt as to the answer. 'The Brethren' formed a body joined together in a common discipline as in a common faith[1]. They accepted the sacred Scriptures without reserve, and Tertullian for his part would not allow that to these Scriptures 'heretics' had any right of appeal. The Christian writings, he urges, belong to the Christian Society, and their true meaning and application cannot be discerned outside its borders[2].

The distinction between layman and priest (*sacerdos*) was fully recognized in this society. Tertullian is the first writer, so far as we know, who applies the term *sacerdos* to the Christian minister; but he uses the term without any explanation or apology, not deeming that it needed defence. Even in one of his Montanist treatises[3], where he is arguing that laymen are no more free to contract second marriages than priests are, the distinction appears clearly. Everyone is aware, he says, that priests may not remarry. But we must remember that laymen, too, are priests (*sacerdotes*). The difference between Christian layman and Christian priest is not a difference of caste, but is due to the authority of the Christian Society itself, which has made the distinction. The laity are the *plebs*; the clergy are the *ordo* or senatorial order[4]. If a layman were separated unavoidably from the organized society, he would have to act as a priest for himself. 'Where there is no bench of clergy, you present the offering

[1] *Apol.* 39; cp. *de Pud.* 11. [2] *De praescr.* 37.

[3] *De exhort. cast.* 7, written about 203; cp. *de monog.* 11, 12.

[4] Differentiam inter ordinem et plebem constituit ecclesiae auctoritas et honor per ordinis consessum sanctificatus (*de exhort. cast.* 7). The last clause seems to indicate that the dignity of the clergy was marked by the setting aside of special benches for them (see Lightfoot *Philippians* p. 254 [255]).

and baptize, and are your own sole priest[1].' Wherever there are three Christians gathered together, although they be laymen, there is a Church. 'Ubi tres, ecclesia est, licet laici.' He argues, in short, that since a layman is potentially a priest, and in case of necessity may act as one and celebrate both sacraments, it follows that he ought to be subject to the same moral discipline as that which is enjoined upon a priest. A priest who has remarried can neither baptize nor offer the Eucharist; and the like restriction should be enforced for a layman[2].

Tertullian's argument as to the unlawfulness of remarriage for laymen was never accepted in the Church; it is one of the extravagances of logic which are to be found in his Montanist writings. But it is significant that even here he argues for a similarity of discipline for laymen and priests, not by denying the sacerdotal character of the ordained ministers of the Church, but by laying emphasis on the potential *sacerdotium* of the lay people. The priest in the Church of Africa was constituted such by the Church's authority, and he discharged functions by virtue of his office which could not normally be undertaken by a layman.

Again, bishops, priests, and deacons are clearly distinguished by Tertullian. There have been bishops from the beginning, and one of the tests by which heretical bodies stand condemned is that they cannot produce the register of bishops which attests their apostolical descent[3]. Heresy has the taint of novelty, and is always marked by disorder; no permanence is claimed by heretics for their ministries. 'One will

[1] Adeo ubi ecclesiastici ordinis non est consessus, et offers et tinguis et sacerdos es tibi solus (*de exhort. cast.* 7).

[2] Digamus tinguis? Digamus offers? Quanto magis laico digamo capitale est agere pro sacerdote, cum ipsi sacerdoti digamo facto auferatur agere sacerdotem! (*ibid.*).

[3] *De praescr.* 32.

be the bishop to-day, another to-morrow ; the deacon of to-day will be a reader to-morrow ; the presbyter of to-day a layman to-morrow, for they assign sacerdotal functions to their laymen[1].' The last sentence seems to indicate that while Tertullian remained a Catholic he would not have admitted so explicitly, as we have seen that he did when a Montanist, the potential *sacerdotium* of the layman ; but it may imply no more than his repudiation of the idea that, in normal circumstances, a layman may exercise at will all the functions of a priest. It is to be observed that Tertullian uses *presbyter* and *sacerdos* interchangeably, it being the presbyter's office to perform the *sacerdotalia munera*.

The bishop is, for him, the *summus sacerdos*, as the Jewish high priest was called of old. His authority is not merely such an authority as belongs to the head of any organization, in virtue of which, for example, he could prescribe fasts[2] ; but it extends so far that the authority of priests and deacons is dependent upon delegation from him. To usurp his office gives rise to schism. He is the fountain of order and the guardian of discipline. For instance, the bishop is the normal minister of baptism, but his authority in this ministration may be delegated to priests and deacons. In case of necessity, even laymen may baptize, provided that they have the bishop's sanction, the reason assigned being that as all equally share the baptismal gift, so all have equally the power of distributing it[3]. This last principle is obviously one of far-reaching importance, and it came prominently

[1] Itaque alius hodie episcopus, cras alius ; hodie diaconus, qui cras lector ; hodie presbyter, qui cras laicus ; nam et laicis sacerdotalia munera iniungunt (*ibid.* 41).

[2] *De ieiunio* 13.

[3] Dandi quidem habet ius summus sacerdos qui est episcopus. Dehinc presbyteri et diaconi, non tamen sine episcopi auctoritate, propter ecclesiae honorem, quo saluo salua pax est. Alioquin etiam laicis ius est. Quod enim ex aequo accipitur ex aequo dari potest (*de bapt.* 17).

into view at a later date, when the question of Rebaptism had to be settled; it is sufficient here to note that Tertullian would not allow it to apply to women, for he deprecates with vehemence the notion that a woman should be allowed to minister the sacrament of baptism in any circumstances.

We know little or nothing of the Church of Carthage between the years 230 and 250. But with the consecration of Cyprian as bishop and the outbreak of the Decian persecution we enter upon a period for which the writings of Cyprian provide much information. Our purpose now is to put together what these writings have to tell about the constitution and status of the Christian Ministry in North Africa, and the doctrine of that Ministry which Cyprian held. Since Cyprian was accustomed to speak of Tertullian as his 'master[1],' it has been desirable to collect Tertullian's opinions on this subject, as a preliminary to our investigation.

III

To appreciate the merits or the defects of Cyprian's doctrine of the Ministry, we must bear in mind his own personal training. This was not like the training of a modern ecclesiastic. He was bred a lawyer, and enjoyed a high reputation for eloquence and sagacity. He was accustomed to deal with subtle distinctions, and also, as lawyers are continually engaged with practical matters, he was a man of the world, in the best sense. Well educated, but no great scholar (he does not seem to have known the Greek language), he came under Christian influences when already a man of established position and of good fortune. It was not surprising that he should at once take rank as a person of importance in the Christian community of Carthage; and his baptism was speedily followed by his admission to the

[1] Jerome *de vir. illustr.* 53.

presbyterate, to the satisfaction of all. He was marked out as a leader by the popular voice, and some two years after his baptism, in 248, on the death of Donatus, the bishop of Carthage, he was called to the episcopal office. He had been diligent in the study of Christian beliefs during this short period; and his *Testimonia* or collections of Scripture texts, in particular, illustrate a mastery of detail, and a capacity for summarizing the doctrines of the faith, then new to him, in which may be traced the influence of his legal training.

Raised, while still a Christian 'novice,' to his high place as leader of the Christian Church in Carthage, which implied the leadership of the whole African Church, he was almost at once called to cope with circumstances of great difficulty, to decide great issues quickly and authoritatively, to advise and guide a church vexed with internal dissensions and subjected to fierce persecution by the imperial authority. He was ten years a bishop before his course was ended by martyrdom, and during these years of incessant anxiety and labour the Letters and Treatises by which we know him best were produced. These are not the speculations of a quiet scholar in his study; they are pastoral counsels called forth by the necessities of his life, often written in haste and with the consciousness that they would be criticized with severity by his opponents. The writings of Cyprian are practical and devotional rather than theological; and it is rather as a great and saintly bishop than as a *doctor ecclesiae* that his memory is held in honour by the Church.

IV

We have seen already that the distinction between the clergy and the lay people was well understood at Carthage before Cyprian's day. The clergy were the *ordo*; the people were the *plebs*. A regular

monthly stipend, as well as a regular allowance in kind, was provided for the presbyters[1], who were forbidden to engage in secular employments. It was enacted by an African Council of bishops that no ecclesiastic should serve as the executor of a will, and Cyprian reminded his presbyters, shortly after he had become a bishop, that this rule must be enforced, 'since everyone honoured with the holy priesthood and ordained to clerical ministries ought only to serve the altar and the sacrifices, and ought to apply himself wholly to intercessions and prayers[2].' The terms used of the Church's ministries, in this the earliest of Cyprian's letters, *sacerdotium*, *altare*, *sacrificia*, are characteristic, and significant of the principles which were fundamental in his scheme of Christian belief.

'Sacerdotal' language did not begin with Cyprian. As we have seen[3], Tertullian uses *presbyter* and *sacerdos* interchangeably, and does not stay to explain or apologize for this identification. Cyprian, however, departs from Tertullian's usage in this respect that, as a general rule, he reserves the term *sacerdos* for a bishop, as distinct from a presbyter, although the presbyters share in the sacerdotal dignity. By the *collegium sacerdotale*[4], Cyprian means the College of Bishops. Of Cornelius he says that 'he was not suddenly raised to the *episcopate*, but having been promoted through all the ecclesiastical offices he mounted to the lofty pinnacle of the *priesthood* (*sacerdotium*)[5].' We shall see, as we proceed, that this use of language might be

[1] *Ep.* XXXIX 5; cp. XLI 2.

[2] Quando singuli diuino sacerdotio honorati et in clerico ministerio constituti non nisi altari et sacrificiis deseruire et precibus atque orationibus uacare debeant (*Ep.* I 1).

[3] See p. 223.

[4] *Ep.* LV 1.

[5] *Ep.* LV 8. It is noticeable that the idea that 'the Christian clergy consisted of a hierarchy of grades, through each of which it was *necessary* to pass in order to reach the higher offices' was not yet current. See Turner *Cambridge Medieval History* I p. 150.

traced back to Origen, who speaks often of bishops as 'the Lord's priests.'

It does not come within the scope of this essay to examine the origin and developement of the doctrine of priesthood in the Christian Church, for we are only concerned with the doctrine which was held by Cyprian and his African contemporaries. The nearest approach in the New Testament to the use of the word ἱερεύς for a Christian minister is a phrase of St Paul, who speaks of himself as 'ministering as a priest (*or* ministering in sacrifice) the Gospel of God[1]'; but it is remarkable that this idea does not appear in the Pastoral Epistles, where we should expect to find it. It seems probable that the Eucharistic language of the early Church prepared the way for, and suggested, the use of the term 'priest' to denote the minister of the Church's offering to God[2]. For example, the term does not appear in Ignatius as a designation of the Christian minister, but the sacramental doctrine of that Father is so unequivocal that it would naturally be associated with the sacerdotal conception of the ministry. Again, Justin Martyr insists that Christians are the true high-priestly family of God, and that God does not accept sacrifices from any except through his priests; hence 'all who offer the sacrifices which Jesus commanded to be offered, i.e. in the Eucharist of the Bread and of the Cup, which are offered everywhere by Christians, are pleasing to Him[3].' Neither in this passage nor elsewhere does Justin speak of the 'priesthood' of the Church's ministry as distinct from the priesthood of all believers; but the transition from language which describes the Eucharist as 'offered' everywhere by Christians, who are a priestly race, to the use of the term 'priest' as designating the minister of the Eucharist, is easy to follow.

[1] ἱερουργοῦντα τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ (Rom. xv 16).
[2] Cp. Harnack *Constitution and Law of the Church* Engl. Tr. p. 118.
[3] *Tryph.* 117.

Whether the developement of the Church's nomenclature proceeded along these lines or no, it is not doubtful that Cyprian's doctrine of priesthood meant, primarily, a doctrine of *sacrifice*. When writing to Cornelius, he and other bishops describe themselves as 'priests who daily celebrate the sacrifices of God[1].' And, again, when urging the duty of reverence in common worship, he writes: 'When we come together with the brethren and celebrate the divine sacrifices with God's priest, we ought to be mindful of reverence and order[2].' And his challenge to schismatical ministers shews that he regarded the 'offering of sacrifices' as the central and essential part of a bishop's duty. 'What kind of sacrifices do *they* suppose themselves to offer, who set themselves up as rivals of the *sacerdotes*[3]?' Their presumption is like that of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, who took to themselves the privilege of sacrificing[4].

The parallel which is assumed, rather than argued, in Cyprian's writings between the ministers of the Old Covenant and those of the New is somewhat unexpected. He does not find the original of bishop, presbyter, and deacon, in the Jewish hierarchy of High Priest, Priest, and Levite, as Tertullian and others had done. For Cyprian, Christ Himself is the new High Priest, 'summus sacerdos Dei Patris[5]'; the Christian bishop takes the place of the Jewish priest, while the presbyters and deacons represent the Levitical tribe[6]. The office of a bishop is primarily a sacrificial office, as was that of the Jewish priests[7].

[1] Ut sacerdotes qui sacrificia dei cotidie celebramus (*Ep.* LVII 3).

[2] Quando in unum cum fratribus conuenimus et sacrificia diuina cum dei sacerdote celebramus, uerecundiae et disciplinae memores esse debemus (*de dom. or.* 4).

[3] Quae sacrificia celebrare se credunt aemuli sacerdotum? (*de unit.* 13).

[4] *ibid.* 18. [5] *Ep.* LXIII 14. [6] *Ep.* I 2.

[7] Origen uses similar language: Discant sacerdotes domini qui ecclesiis praesunt quia pars eis data est cum his quorum delicta repropitiauerint (*Hom. in Lev.* V 4).

A bishop's office is also, and consequentially, an office of *intercession*. Cyprian urges that this aspect of episcopal duty makes it of special importance that only men of good life and conversation should be chosen as bishops, that they 'worthily offering sacrifices to God may be heard in the prayers which they make for the safety of the Lord's people[1].' So, too, when the Confessors at Rome—presbyters, deacons, and others—write to Cyprian from prison asking his prayers, they say, 'To whom should we rather give in charge to ask these things for us than to so eminent a Bishop, that those who are destined for victims may seek help from the priest[2]?' And the same thought is behind Cyprian's appeal to sinners to confess their sins while there is yet time, 'while the satisfaction and remission wrought through the priests are pleasing before the Lord[3].'

Little is said explicitly in Cyprian's writings about the *teaching* office of a bishop[4], although the idea that the bishop is *doctor ecclesiae* and that his decision on disputed points of doctrine or practice is final and authoritative lies behind many of his Epistles. It is rather as rulers of the Church than as its teachers that Cyprian conceives of himself and of his brethren in the episcopate. If Ignatius regarded the bishop mainly as the centre of unity, while Irenaeus laid stress rather on his office as the custodian of the apostolic doctrine and guardian of the faith, to Cyprian the bishop is the 'vicegerent of Christ[5].' He is the divinely appointed ruler and guide;

[1] In ordinationibus sacerdotum non nisi inmaculatos et integros antistites eligere debemus, qui sancte et digne sacrificia deo offerentes audiri in precibus possint quas faciunt pro plebis dominicae incolumitate (*Ep.* LXVII 2).

[2] Cui enim magis haec ut pro nobis petat mandare debemus quam tam glorioso episcopo, ut hostiae destinati petant auxilium de sacerdote (*Ep.* XXXI 5)? Perhaps we should, with several MSS, read *destinatae*.

[3] Dum satisfactio et remissio [facta] per sacerdotes apud dominum grata est (*de laps.* 29).

[4] Allusion is made to the instruction given in the bishop's sermons (*episcopo tractante*) in *Ep.* LV 14. [5] Lightfoot *Philippians* p. 238 [240].

and as the dispenser of the gifts of grace to the faithful, he is in a true sense God's representative to the people over whom he is placed.

Such being Cyprian's doctrine of the episcopal office, it is natural that stress should be laid upon the steps by which it is reached and the sanctions with which it is conferred. The conditions of a valid election to the episcopate are considered by him more than once. In a letter addressed 'to the presbyters and deacons and all the people' he mentions that it was customary to consult them 'in clerical ordinations,' and says that if he dispensed with their advice in the ordination of one Aurelius to the office of 'reader[1],' the omission was justified by the high character and repute of the person thus ordained[2]. And in the more important case of the election of a bishop, he explains that the precedents of the Old Testament demand that the people should be cognizant of the choice that is made. The vestments of Aaron were placed upon Eleazar before the whole congregation[3]; and the Christian *sacerdos* or bishop must be chosen in presence of the people, so that they may be assured that the choice has fallen upon one of good conversation and character[4]. This was the course, he adds, adopted at the election of Matthias in the room of Judas, when the disciples, to the number of an hundred and twenty, were present.

We are not, however, to think that the 'suffragium' which the people exercised was a formal vote. There is no suggestion of anything of this kind. Cyprian's language here and elsewhere conveys the idea that the applause of the people, when the bishop was chosen,

[1] Cyprian describes *readers* and *subdeacons* as *clero proximi* '*next* to the clergy'; they do not belong in strictness to the clerical order (*Ep.* XXIX). He mentions also *acolytes* (*Ep.* VII) and *exorcists* (*Ep.* XXIII). See p. 305.

[2] *Ep.* XXXVIII 1, 2.

[3] Num. XX 25, 26.

[4] *Ep.* LXVII 4. Cp. Origen *Hom. in Lev.* VI 3: Requiritur in ordinando sacerdote et praesentia populi... ille eligitur ad sacerdotium, et hoc adstante populo.

proclaimed their assent and gave them a principal share in the responsibility of the election; further, that their presence provided a security that only men of good morals should be chosen; but it does not imply that the votes of the *plebs* were taken in any formal manner. This appears clearly from the next paragraph of the epistle already cited, where the African procedure is more fully described. The neighbouring bishops of the province are to meet when the see is vacant, and then the bishop is to be chosen *plebe praesente*. This was done in the case of Sabinus 'ut de universae fraternitatis suffragio et de episcoporum...iudicio episcopatus ei deferretur et manus ei...inponeretur[1].' It will be observed that the *suffragium* of the brethren generally is carefully distinguished from the *iudicium* of the bishops present, and also (a point to which we must return) that the election is distinguished from the subsequent imposition of hands, or, as we call it, 'consecration.' Cyprian had used similar expressions when justifying the validity of the election of Cornelius[2]. This took place at Rome, and Cyprian recalls not only the *suffragium* of the people, but the witness of a large majority of the clergy. It would appear from the way in which he expresses himself that the testimony of the clergy was not taken separately from that of the laity, nor indeed does such a practice seem to have arisen until the fourth century. The *consensus* of the *sacerdotes* or bishops was always an essential factor, although testimonies to good life and conduct came first.

For elections conducted thus, Cyprian claims the Divine sanction. They are, as he says in the case of Cornelius, accomplished 'de Dei et Christi eius iudicio.'

[1] *Ep.* LXVII 5.

[2] Factus est autem Cornelius episcopus de Dei et Christi eius iudicio, de clericorum paene omnium testimonio, de plebis quae tunc adfuit suffragio, de sacerdotum antiquorum et bonorum uirorum consensu (*Ep.* LV 8).

To question this would be to make oneself a judge not of the electing bishops only but of God Himself[1]. For we are not to think that God, who cares for the fall of a sparrow, is careless of the chiefest things that are done in His Church, or that the *sacerdotes*—the bishops—who are His stewards are ordained without His appointment[2].

How, then, if the bishop who is thus lawfully consecrated prove himself unworthy of his office? Cyprian answers that, in such a case, the people ought to break with him, to repudiate his authority, and to refuse his ministrations[3]. 'The oblation cannot be consecrated where the Holy Spirit is not, nor does the Lord grant grace to any through the prayers and supplications of one who has himself done violence to the Lord.' The language is worthy of special notice, for it implies a doctrine of 'orders' somewhat different from that with which the modern Church, both in East and West, is familiar. It will be observed that Cyprian will not allow that the Eucharist can truly be consecrated, so that the faithful are profited thereby, if the minister be an unworthy or heretical bishop. That is to say, he has no thought of the 'indelible character' of the priesthood; nor does he distinguish between *invalid* ministrations and those which are only *irregular*. This is entirely characteristic of Cyprian, and indeed of his age. The stress was then laid on the regularity of *order*; at a later time it was the validity and completeness of the *priesthood* conferred that came into view[4]. For Cyprian, to all intents and purposes the *sacerdotium* is annulled, if the bishop (or presbyter) who

[1] Nemo post diuinum iudicium, post populi suffragium, post coepiscoporum consensum, iudicem se non iam episcopis sed Deo faceret (*Ep.* LIX 5).

[2] *Epp.* LIX 5, LXVI 1.

[3] *Epp.* LXV 4, LXVII 3.

[4] See Turner *Cambridge Medieval History* I p. 156.

has received it is repudiated by the Church, and his ministry therefore rendered irregular.

Thus Cyprian deals alike with the case of Catholic clergy who have gone over to the Novatianists, and with the case of laymen who have received Novatianist ordination. In either case, if they return to the communion of the Church, they must return as mere laymen. He stigmatizes as shameful the idea that such persons should be permitted 'to retain the arms of ordination and of honour with which they had rebelled[1].' He does not attempt to distinguish, as later writers would have done, between the power of the priesthood and the legitimacy of its exercise.

V

At this point it is convenient to indicate the nature of the duties which the presbyters at Carthage were accustomed to discharge. There is no suggestion anywhere that the power of ordaining others was theirs, or that they had any share in the consecration of a bishop. Upon that it is unnecessary to dwell. But, further, they had no separate voice, as we have seen, even in the *election* of a bishop, their witness to the suitability of the person advanced to that office being not distinguished from that of the laity. They were, however, consulted by the bishop in all important matters[2]. They sat with the bishop in determining the case, already mentioned, of a presbyter who had been appointed executor of a will[3]. The question of the restoration of the lapsed to communion was considered by the bishop with the clergy in the presence of the faithful laity[4]. And we have seen that the presbyters were usually consulted by the bishop before admitting anyone to orders[5]. In the absence of Cyprian

[1] Ordinationis et honoris arma retinere (*Ep.* LXXII 2).
[2] *Epp.* XXXVIII 1, XXIV 1.
[3] *Ep.* I 1.
[4] *Ep.* XIX 2; cp. XLIII 2.
[5] *Ep.* XXXVIII 1.

from Carthage, they were entrusted with matters of administration, financial and philanthropic[1], but larger questions were reserved until he could return and consult formally with his clergy[2].

It is, indeed, true that a faction at Carthage was dissatisfied with Cyprian's authority and dissented from his decisions. His election, while yet a neophyte, to the office of bishop was displeasing to some among his presbyters, and four of their number addressed a letter[3] to him, while he was in retirement, which seems to have advocated milder dealing with the lapsed than he favoured. They seized on this question—the merits of which do not concern us here—as providing a rallying cry against Cyprian himself. The intrigues of Novatus the presbyter caused much difficulty, and ultimately led to the setting up of a schismatical bishop, one Fortunatus, in opposition to Cyprian at Carthage. But there is no evidence that the recognized position of the presbyters was altered in any way by the influence of Cyprian during his anxious episcopate. They were the bishop's coadjutors; they gave him counsel; they acted in his absence by a delegated authority from him; but he was more than the leading presbyter. He had a distinct office and an authoritative voice.

The same may be said of the position of the presbyters at Rome, whose correspondence with Cyprian during the vacancy of the Roman see is highly instructive. Cyprian's departure from Carthage at the beginning of the Decian persecution had been the subject of comment at Rome; and the Roman presbyters wrote to him and also to the Carthaginian presbyters on the subject. The latter of these letters is extant, and also Cyprian's dignified reply[4]. The Roman clergy were the legitimate guardians of the Church of the

[1] *Epp.* V, XII, XIV.
[2] *Ep.* XXXIV 3.
[3] See *Epp.* XIV 4; XVIII 1.
[4] *Epp.* VIII and IX.

principal city of the Empire, during the interval between the martyrdom of Fabian and the consecration of Cornelius; and it was natural that, in their ignorance of the circumstances of Cyprian's withdrawal from Carthage, they should address a letter of sympathy and advice to the Church there, which they mistakenly supposed to be at the time without any episcopal guidance, and thus in the same case as their own Church. Their advice was given in regard to such matters as the encouragement of those in danger of apostasy, the ministration to the sick and those in prison, the care of the catechumens, and the readmission to communion of lapsed persons, who were penitent and sick—all of them matters which did not admit of any postponement. But the tone of their later letter to Cyprian, when they had received his short reply, is very different[1]. They thank him for informing them of the facts of the situation at Carthage, that they might be 'partners in his counsels,' and express their entire satisfaction. They speak of the importance of maintaining the Church's discipline, and go on to explain that they cannot determine at Rome the difficult questions involved in the readmission of the *lapsi* in general, as long as they are without a bishop. That was not within their power, as presbyters, to do. 'On account of the difficulty of the times no bishop has yet been appointed, who should settle all these matters and could with authority and counsel take account of the lapsed.' And they express agreement with Cyprian's oft-repeated decision that these perplexed questions must await a time and place when a full conference of bishops, clergy, and people can be assembled[2]. Afterwards when Cornelius had been consecrated Bishop of Rome, this course was taken, with his full approval[3]. There is thus no trace, either at Carthage or at Rome, of

[1] *Ep.* XXX. The actual writer of this letter was Novatian.
[2] *Ep.* XXX 5: compare *Ep.* XXXI 6. [3] Eus. *H. E.* VI 43. 2

any independent or separate authority resident in the presbyters without the bishop. 'The priests,' says Batiffol, 'are somewhat like mute personages, who follow the bishop and second him, but have no history of their own except when they rebel, which they do at times, as did Novatus at Carthage and Novatian at Rome[1].'

In truth, it is a perversion of history to regard the authority of the bishop over his presbyters as a developement which was unknown in early times, and which only came into prominence after the days of Constantine, when the Church was 'established.' The facts point in the opposite direction. The 'evolution of the presbyterate,' rather than the 'evolution of the episcopate,' is the process which history offers to our view. As Mr Turner puts it: 'In the fourth and fifth centuries presbyters are establishing a new independence in face of the bishop, rather than bishops exerting a new and stricter authority over presbyters[2].' At Carthage, in the third century, the presbyters who attempted to resist Cyprian's authority were regarded as innovating rebels, and their bishop's difficulties in reducing them to submission were not due to any uncertainty as to his ecclesiastical *status*. They were his delegates, and their authority was derived directly from him. That certain of them were set apart as teachers—*presbyteri doctores*[3]—shews that the teaching office was not regarded as part of their normal function and privilege. Indeed, at this early period presbyters preached but seldom—probably as seldom as a country priest in the Russian Church preaches to-day. The right to preach was delegated, when it was thought desirable by the bishop to do so; but it was not involved in the presbyter's prerogative.

[1] *L'église naissante* Engl. Tr. p. 336.
[2] *Cambridge Medieval History* I p. 163.
[3] *Ep.* XXIX.

So, too, the right to celebrate the Eucharist was regarded as a delegated privilege. The presbyters are, indeed, sharers in the episcopal *sacerdotium*[1]; but they are never allowed to forget that the administration of the sacraments is only lawful for them, so far as it is devolved upon them by the bishop. Thus when Cyprian was absent from Carthage he speaks of the presbyters as 'offering' the Eucharist for the Confessors in prison[2]. The penitent lapsed, when they have made their confession, if they are in danger of death, may be readmitted to the Church by the presbyters, with imposition of hands[3]. Had the bishop been present, he would, with his clergy, have laid hands on the penitent[4]; but in his absence, the presbyters in this case (although not in any more doubtful case) act without him. Cyprian has a stern rebuke, however, for presbyters who admitted to communion lapsed persons in no special danger of death, who had not formally and publicly confessed their sin. This was in defiance of his explicit direction, and it is 'contra euangelii legem' thus 'offerre pro illis et eucharistiam [dare], id est sanctum Domini corpus profanare[5].' But in the urgent case of a very sick man, not only may a presbyter, in the bishop's absence, reconcile him although he had lapsed; but in the presbyter's absence, a deacon may lay his hands on the penitent sinner that he may have peace[6].

The last mentioned provision recalls the principle laid down by Tertullian in his Montanist days, that, in the absence of a priest, a deacon or even a layman may administer the sacraments. But Cyprian would

1 Cum episcopo presbyteri sacerdotali honore coniuncti (*Ep.* LXI 3).
2 Presbyteri qui illic apud confessores offerunt (*Ep.* V 2).
3 Exomologesi facta et manu eis a uobis in paenitentiam inposita (*Ep.* XIX 2).
4 *Ep.* XVI 2.
5 *Ep.* XV 1; cp. *Ep.* XVII 2.
6 *Ep.* XVIII 1.

never have countenanced such a permission, unless it had been explicitly conceded by the bishop in a particular case. It is the *regularity* of the Church's ministrations upon which he perpetually lays stress. 'Nonconformity' is to him a thing abhorrent. Neither he nor any Catholic teacher would have challenged, or found a difficulty in, the New Testament doctrine of the priesthood of the whole Christian people, clergy and laity. The Church is a priestly body. But it does not follow that the lay part of the Church has a priestly prerogative, when distinguished and treated as separate from the clerical part. And Cyprian's view consistently is that the Church's offerings of worship to God must be made through the Church's appointed official, set apart for that purpose by the bishop who is the divinely appointed dispenser of Divine grace. For him, as for Ignatius, that is a true Eucharist which is under the authority of the bishop[1]; he does not need to ask about the *sacerdotium* of the celebrant. And we shall see later on that this insistence on *order* and on the *regularity* of the minister's status, rather than on the validity of his ordination, lies behind Cyprian's doctrine of baptism.

VI

Cyprian has no thought of any episcopate which is not monarchical. There can only be one bishop in each local Church[2], but *he* is essential. The Church consists of the bishop, clergy, and faithful laity[3]. He rebukes the lapsed persons who have had the temerity to write to him in the name of the Church, as if the

[1] ἐκείνη βεβαία εὐχαριστία ἡγείσθω ἡ ὑπὸ τὸν ἐπίσκοπον οὖσα ἢ ᾧ ἂν αὐτὸς ἐπιτρέψῃ (*Smyrn.* 8).

[2] *Ep.* LXVI 5 and *de unit.* 7; cp. *Ep.* XLIX 2 for the same view as expressed by the Roman confessors.

[3] Quando ecclesia in episcopo et clero et in omnibus stantibus sit constituta (*Ep.* XXXIII 1).

bishop were not essential. His words are significant and plain. He quotes the Lord's promise to Peter, and says that the order of the Church, which rests upon the episcopate, goes back to this promise: 'the Church is settled upon the bishops.' So in another Epistle, he explains that the Church consists of the people (*plebs*) united to the bishop (*sacerdos*); that the bishop is in the Church, and the Church in the bishop[1]. There can be no other altar, no other priesthood, no other Church than this[2]. The language is almost identical with that of Ignatius: 'Be careful to observe one Eucharist...there is one altar, as there is one bishop, together with the presbytery and the deacons[3].' And Cyprian is ready to push this doctrine to its austere conclusion in logic: 'Let them remain alone outside the Church who have withdrawn from the Church; let them be alone, without bishops, who have rebelled against bishops[4].'

Even more uncompromising is the language of an earlier Epistle. The man who would not hearken to the Jewish priest was counted worthy of death by the Deuteronomic law[5]. 'Nor let them think that they are in the way of life and salvation if they will not obey the bishops and priests...for the house of God is one, and there cannot be salvation for any save in the Church[6].' Or, as he writes in another place, the Church, being one, 'cannot be both within and without[7].' Or, again, 'whatever he be, he is not a Christian who is not in Christ's Church[8].' Indeed 'he has not God for his Father who has not the Church for his mother[9].'

[1] Illi sunt ecclesia plebs sacerdoti adunata et pastori suo grex adhaerens. Unde scire debes episcopum in ecclesia esse et ecclesiam in episcopo (*Ep.* LXVI 8).

[2] *Ep.* XLIII 5.

[3] *Philad.* 4.

[4] *Ep.* XLIII 5.

[5] Deut. xvii 12.

[6] Cum domus dei una sit et nemini salus esse nisi in ecclesia possit (*Ep.* IV 4).

[7] *Ep.* LXIX 3.

[8] *Ep.* LV 24.

[9] *De unit.* 6; cp. Tertullian *de Orat.* 2.

It would not be easy to state more definitely the privileges of the Church or the necessity of the episcopal order to its life.

Again, not only is the bishop possessed of a unique authority in regard to all those over whom he is set, but this authority is not subject to the control of other bishops. He is independent in his own community. To this principle, Cyprian returns again and again. A lapsed presbyter had been admitted to communion with undue haste by a certain bishop, Therapius, and complaint was made to the African bishops in council. They tell Therapius that he did wrong, but they do not take upon themselves to reverse his decision[1]. A contumelious deacon had offended another bishop, Rogatianus, who complained of his conduct to Cyprian and his colleagues. Cyprian acknowledges the humility of Rogatianus, but points out that he could have excommunicated the deacon on his own authority, with the exercise of which the other bishops would not have interfered[2]. Jubaianus, a Mauretanian bishop, wrote to Cyprian on the subject of the rebaptism of heretics. Cyprian gives his opinion at length, but concludes by repudiating any jurisdiction in the case : 'prescribing to or prejudging no one, as if each bishop should not do what he thinks best, having the free exercise of his own judgement[3].' The eighty-seven bishops assembled at the Seventh Council of Carthage held in 256 to consider the same question of rebaptism use almost the same words and add significantly that none of them sets himself up as a 'bishop of bishops[4].' Shortly before the Council met, Cyprian had written to Stephen the Bishop of Rome in similar terms. We make no law, he says, 'since each prelate has, in the

[1] *Ep.* LXIV 1.
[2] *Ep.* III 1 (the date of this letter is uncertain).
[3] *Ep.* LXXIII 26.
[4] *Sent. episc.* praef. (Hartel p. 436).

administration of the Church, the free exercise of his will, and has to give an account of his acts to God alone[1].'

It is remarkable that the man who lays such stress upon the independence of each bishop should have also set such store by the deliberations of Councils of bishops. The practice of summoning the bishops of a province to deliberate about grave questions of Church policy was not, of course, inaugurated by Cyprian. It was well established by the time of Origen in Greek-speaking countries, and there had been Councils of Carthage long before Cyprian became a bishop. But they were of special importance in the turbulent and difficult days of his episcopate, and it was natural that the results of their deliberations should be reported far and wide throughout the Christian world. Cyprian is careful to insist that the vote of each bishop is as weighty as that of his neighbour, all bishops being in theory equal. But, in point of fact, it was inevitable (as it is still) in all such assemblies that the bishops of the greater cities should have more influence than those of remote country districts. This was the beginning of the primatial prerogatives at Carthage as well as at Rome. And there is no reason to doubt that Cyprian, who presided at the Councils of Carthage, exercised an effective influence, and was Primate in fact as well as in name.

The second principle laid down by Cyprian is perhaps less easy to apply in practice, viz. that the decrees of such Councils are not binding on individual bishops. In his view, the Council was only a deliberative and advisory body, and possessed no coercive power. It is essential to Cyprian's doctrine of the episcopate, that each bishop should be really and not

[1] *Ep.* LXXII 3. Augustine sums up the Cyprianic doctrine of unity in diversity in the formula 'saluo iure communionis diuersa sentire' (*de bapt. c. Donat.* VI vii 10).

only theoretically independent of his colleagues; and this was the position which he consistently opposed to the claims of Stephen for a unique jurisdiction and authority. There are no 'bishops of bishops.' In a case where the bishops assembled in Council cannot agree on a point of discipline, they must be content to differ. Thus, on one occasion there was some disagreement among the African bishops as to the admission of penitent adulterers to communion, and Cyprian explains that their divergent action must not be interpreted as a breach of the Church's unity. 'So long as the bond of concord remains, and the sacrament of the Catholic Church continues indissoluble, each bishop orders and directs his own proceedings[1].'

VII

In what, then, does the Unity of the Church consist? If each bishop is independent in his own diocese, and different rules as to discipline prevail, how is the *uinculum concordiae* to be preserved? These are the questions to which Cyprian set himself to give formulated answers in his famous treatise *On the Unity of the Catholic Church*. The occasion of its composition was the crisis caused by the Novatianist schism at Rome[2], which assumed formidable shape just when the first Council of bishops held after the Decian persecution had assembled at Carthage in the year 251. The prelates had come together in the first instance, in order that a settled decision might be reached as to the restoration of those who had fallen away—the question of the lapsed. But when they met, they learnt first that

[1] Manente concordiae uinculo et perseuerante catholicae ecclesiae indiuiduo sacramento, actum suum disponit et dirigit unusquisque episcopus (*Ep.* LV 21).

[2] This is the generally accepted view. Dom Chapman has argued that the treatise was composed before the Council met, and that it was occasioned by the schism of the deacon Felicissimus at Carthage, rather than by the Novatianist schism at Rome (*Revue Bénédictine* 1903 p. 26 ff.).

Cornelius had been consecrated bishop of Rome, and then that his election had been challenged by the rigorist party, and that Novatian had also received consecration at the hands of some bishops, in the interests of those who favoured the principle that the lapsed could never be restored to the Church's communion. There was a good deal of uncertainty as to the facts of the case, and the African bishops did not recognize Cornelius until they had satisfied themselves by careful enquiry that the charges against him were untrue, and that his election and consecration had been regular. But greater questions at once came to the front: What is the responsibility of the Church of Africa in regard to the schism in the Church of Rome? On what grounds can the principle—no new principle—of the unity of the Church be defended? And what is the position of an individual bishop, independent in his own community, in relation to the Church of Christ at large? Many times in earlier days, Christian bishops had to deal with questions of *heresy*, but the question of *schism* which was not prompted by heretical belief, and owed its origin solely to a question of the extent of the Church's disciplinary powers, had not emerged before. It was necessary to go back to first principles, and this was Cyprian's aim in the treatise which he composed while the Council of Carthage was in session[1].

His argument, in brief, is as follows: The Church's unity is firmly to be maintained, being taught in Scripture, and especially in St Paul's 'One Lord, One Faith, One Baptism...One Body and One Spirit[2].' In the beginning the Church was founded upon one man, St Peter, just in order that its unity might be made

[1] It does not seem to me adequate to say that the *de unitate* 'is concerned exclusively with the thesis, that in every Church there is room for but one bishop' (Batiffol *L'église naissante* Engl. Tr. p. 364). Its arguments take a wider range.

[2] Eph. iv 4.

clear. But all the apostles were, nevertheless, given equal honour and dignity with St Peter; and the present unity of the Church is founded on the unity of the collective episcopate, which is a whole in which each bishop enjoys full possession. 'The episcopate is one, of which each part is held by individuals for the whole[1].' That is, each bishop being independent in his own particular sphere has yet a responsibility for the whole Church. His authority is 'a tenure upon a totality, like that of a shareholder in some joint property[2].' What the bishop is to his own diocese—the guardian and symbol of unity—such is the College of bishops to the whole Church. The unity of the Church is found in the unity of the episcopate, which—Cyprian suggests—is rooted in charity and mutual forbearance. 'There is one God and one Christ and one Church of His and one Faith and one People joined by the cement of concord in the solid unity of the Body[3].' The 'cement of concord' is the moral guarantee of unity amid variety of discipline; and the unity of the College of bishops provides the best security for this.

It is impossible to suppose that a treatise like this was composed without the position and prerogatives of the Roman see being clearly before the mind of the writer. It was probably written, as has been observed already, with a direct reference to the Novatianist schism at Rome. And even if, as some think[4], this was not its immediate occasion, it was certainly written with a full consciousness that its arguments would be

[1] Episcopatus unus est, cuius a singulis in solidum pars tenetur (*de unit.* 5).

[2] Benson *Cyprian* p. 182.

[3] Plebs una in solidam corporis unitatem concordiae glutino copulata (*de unit.* 23). Cp. 'ecclesia quae catholica una est scissa non sit neque diuisa, sed sit utique conexa et cohaerentium sibi inuicem sacerdotum glutino copulata' (*Ep.* LXVI 8).

[4] See p. 242 n. 2 above.

scrutinized at Rome with a jealous attention. In these circumstances the terms in which Cyprian expressed his view of the Church's unity, and his interpretation of the Lord's promise to Peter, must be taken as deliberately chosen, and therefore as significant both in respect of what is said and what is not said. The famous passage in the *de unitate*[1], which has been the starting-point for so much controversy, must now be given at length.

'The Lord speaks to Peter, *I say unto thee* (saith He) *that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound also in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed also in heaven.* He builds His Church upon one man; and—although after His resurrection He assigns equal power to all the apostles and says, *As my Father sent me, even so send I you; receive ye the Holy Ghost; whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted to them; whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained*—yet, that He might make its unity manifest, He so ordered by His authority the origin of this unity that it began with one man. Certainly the other apostles were what Peter was, endowed with an equal fellowship of honour and power; but the beginning starts from unity, that Christ's Church may be shewn to be one. To this one Church the Holy Spirit in the Person of the Lord points in the Song of Songs and says: *My dove, my spotless one, is but one; she is the only one of her mother,*

[1] c. 4. The literature is voluminous. Attention may be directed however to a brilliant and courageous book by Dr Hugo Koch, a Roman Catholic scholar, entitled *Cyprian und der römische Primat* (Texte und Untersuchungen III v 1: Leipzig 1910). Koch will not allow that Cyprian recognized any supreme authority in the Roman See. The most capable criticism of Koch's work is that by Dom Chapman in the *Revue Bénédictine* for 1910 (p. 447 ff.); but it does not seem (to the present writer, at least) to refute Koch's main contentions.

elect of her that bare her. Does he who holds not this unity of the Church believe that he holds the faith? Is he who strives against and resists the Church confident that he is in the Church? Since the blessed apostle Paul also teaches this same thing and sets forth the sacrament of unity when he says *There is One Body and One Spirit*, etc.[1]'

From this passage it is clear that for Cyprian the essential point in Matt. xvi 18 is not that the Church is built upon *Peter*, but that it is built upon *one man*[2]. The origin of the Church's unity may be traced up to this historical episode. Yet the Scripture texts from which Cyprian essays to prove that the Church is essentially and necessarily one are Cant. vi 8 and Eph. iv 4, rather than the passage from St Matthew. And he hastens to point out that whatever authority is given to Peter in Matt. xvi 18, 19 is after the Resurrection given equally to all the apostles in John xx 21—23.

This view of Matt. xvi 18, 19 appears again and again in Cyprian's writings. 'There is only one Church,' he says, 'founded by Christ our Lord upon

[1] Loquitur Dominus ad Petrum: 'ego tibi dico, inquit, quia tu es Petrus etc.' [Matt. xvi 18, 19]. Super *unum* aedificat ecclesiam, et quamuis apostolis omnibus post resurrectionem suam parem potestatem tribuat et dicat: 'sicut misit me pater etc.' [John xx 21—23], tamen *ut unitatem manifestaret*, unitatis eiusdem originem *ab uno incipientem* sua auctoritate disposuit. Hoc erant utique et ceteri apostoli quod fuit Petrus, *pari consortio praediti et honoris et potestatis*, sed exordium ab unitate proficiscitur, ut ecclesia Christi una monstretur. Quam unam ecclesiam etiam in Cantico Canticorum Spiritus sanctus ex persona Domini designat et dicit: 'una est columba etc.' [Cant. vi 8]. Hanc ecclesiae unitatem qui non tenet, tenere se fidem credit? Qui ecclesiae renititur et resistit, in ecclesia se esse confidit? Quando et beatus apostolus Paulus hoc idem doceat et sacramentum unitatis ostendat dicens 'unum corpus et unus spiritus etc.' [Eph. iv 4, 5]. The words in italics do not appear in the alternative or interpolated text of this famous passage (see p. 251 below).

[2] Cp. Koch l.c. p. 11 'Dass es Einer war, mit dem die Kirche ihren Anfang nahm, ist ihm die Hauptsache; dass dieser Eine gerade Petrus war, ist Nebensache.'

Peter, with unity for its starting point and its main idea[1].' It is, again, not the person of Peter that affects the conclusion, but the *one* man on whom the Church was founded. In like manner: 'To Peter first, on whom He built the Church, and from whom He made her unity to originate and shewed it forth, the Lord gave that power, that whatsoever he had loosed should be loosed; and after His resurrection also He speaks to the apostles, saying, *As my Father hath sent me, so send I you*[2].' This is exactly the argument of the passage in *de unitate* 4. So also in an earlier letter, having quoted Matt. xvi 18, 19, Cyprian proceeds: 'Thence the ordination of bishops and the order of the Church run down through the course of time and changes of succession, so that the Church is settled upon the bishops, and every act of the Church is governed by these same prelates[3].' There is no hint here of any special prerogative of Peter, the point of the argument being that all bishops are successors of the apostles. And this is Cyprian's consistent position; his argument in the *de unitate* is not developed for the first time in that treatise; it appears elsewhere in his letters, and at an earlier date.

Cyprian recognizes, to be sure, in Peter the first bishop of Rome. Fabian was 'in the place of Peter[4],'

[1] Una ecclesia a Christo Domino nostro super Petrum origine unitatis et ratione fundata (*Ep.* LXX 3).

[2] Petro primum Dominus, super quem aedificauit ecclesiam et unde unitatis originem instituit et ostendit, potestatem istam dedit ut id solueretur quod ille soluisset, et post resurrectionem quoque ad apostolos loquitur dicens: 'sicut misit me pater etc.' (*Ep.* LXXIII 7). This exegesis is accepted and restated in Firmilian's letter to Cyprian (*Ep.* LXXV 16). It is found also in almost identical terms in the Third Epistle (§ 26) of St Pacian of Barcelona (ob. 392): commenting on Matt. xvi 18, 19, he says 'He spake to one, that from one he might lay the foundation of unity.'

[3] Inde per temporum et successionum uices episcoporum ordinatio et ecclesiae ratio decurrit ut ecclesia super episcopos constituatur, et omnis actus ecclesiae per eosdem praepositos gubernetur (*Ep.* XXXIII 1).

[4] *Ep.* LV 8.

and Rome is the 'cathedra Petri[1].' It is noteworthy that Cyprian is the first writer to speak in this way of the chair of Peter, for in earlier days Paul had been regarded as a joint founder with Peter of the see of Rome. But Cyprian does not hesitate to use the phrase, and in a sense he would allow a certain primacy to the bishop of the *principalis ecclesia*[2]. He never forgets that the Lord chose Peter first, and said that the Church was built upon him, while he will not allow that this historical fact provides any basis for a permanent and special authority being claimed by Peter's successors. Peter did not even claim the primacy in any form when he disputed with Paul. 'Nor did Peter whom the Lord chose first, and on whom He built His Church, when Paul afterwards disputed with him about circumcision, claim or assume anything insolently or arrogantly for himself, so as to say that he held the primacy and should rather be obeyed by novices junior to himself[3].' This was exactly what Pope Stephen did, and what neither Cyprian nor the Eastern bishops would allow. The soundness of the conclusion which Cyprian reached in his controversy with Stephen about the rebaptism of heretics is another matter; but the point here is that in writing to the Pope[4], Cyprian assumes that the African Church is quite independent of Rome. He gives Stephen to understand that he acknowledges no primatial jurisdiction in the Roman see over the Church of North Africa, and he goes his own way. The bishop of Rome is his 'colleague' as other bishops are[5]. The

[1] *Ep.* LIX 14.

[2] Cp. Koch l.c. p. 137 'Cyprian ist Episkopalist vom Scheitel bis zur Fusssohle. Die kirchliche Vorstandschaft besteht aus dem Episkopat und dem übrigen Klerus, ohne in eine oberste Spitze, einen "Primat," ein "Papsttum" auszulaufen.'

[3] *Ep.* LXXI 3.

[4] *Ep.* LXXII.

[5] As Koch points out (l.c. p. 126) while the deacon may call the presbyter 'brother,' and the presbyter may call the bishop 'brother,' they

note of his correspondence with Rome is *coordination*, not *subordination* ; there is love and veneration, but there is also the consciousness of an independent position.

There are a few phrases in Cyprian's Epistles which have been thought to indicate a different attitude, but they are not really inconsistent with the line which he habitually takes. Thus when Cyprian wrote to Cornelius to assure him that he was at last convinced of the validity of his election and consecration as bishop of Rome, he explained that letters of recognition were being sent to Cornelius from the African bishops, in order that all might be in communion with him, 'ut te universi collegae nostri et *communicationem tuam id est catholicae ecclesiae unitatem* pariter et caritatem probarent firmiter ac tenerent[1].' Similarly, writing to bishop Antonianus a little later, he told him that he had forwarded his letter to Cornelius so that the latter might be assured that Antonianus held communion with him, 'that is, with the Catholic Church[2].' But these expressions, taken in their context, mean no more than this—that communion with Cornelius, rather than with Novatian, signified the holding fast in catholic unity and love, just because Cornelius, not Novatian, was the lawful bishop of Rome. In like manner Cyprian exhorted those who sailed from Carthage to Rome, to acknowledge and hold to 'the root of the Catholic Church[3],' that is, the orthodox as opposed to the Novatianist party in the imperial city. There is no room here for the idea that catholic unity is found in union with Cornelius, because he

could not use the word 'colleague,' which is reserved in the Cyprianic writings for the intercourse of bishops with each other.

[1] *Ep.* XLVIII 3.

[2] Te secum, hoc est cum catholica ecclesia communicare (*Ep.* LV 1).

[3] Singulis nauigantibus...nos scimus hortatos esse ut ecclesiae catholicae matricem et radicem agnoscerent ac tenerent (*Ep.* XLVIII 3). The 'matrix et radix' *is* the 'ecclesia catholica,' i.e. the whole Church, not specially the Roman Church. Cp. Koch l.c. p. 76.

was bishop of *Rome*. It was because he was the *lawful* bishop of that city, and not a schismatic, that the faithful were to communicate with him. The language would be precisely the same if the events which called forth the correspondence had happened at Alexandria or Antioch, and not at Rome.

It is quite true, as has already been said, that Cyprian regarded the unity of the Church as *beginning* with the promise to Peter. Rome is 'the chair of Peter and the principal church, whence the sacerdotal unity (i.e. the unity of the collective episcopate) took its rise[1].' But this did not rule the future conditions of the Church's unity. For Cyprian it was not union with Rome, but union with the collective episcopate that was the essential matter. Whether this test is one which will serve us in doubtful cases is, indeed, fair matter for argument. If we press the logical issues too far, we shall find ourselves in a difficulty. For, it may be asked, if *one* bishop only were to break away from all the rest, where is the unity of the collective episcopate to be found[2]? It may be that Cyprian had not completely thought out his problem from a theoretical point of view, but—whether he was logical or illogical—there is no doubt as to the position which he maintained.

Something must be said, however, at this point, as to the famous interpolation or variant reading in c. 4 of the *de unitate*, which seems to indicate a different view, and to bring Cyprian into line with the upholders of a papal jurisdiction resident in the see of Rome. The manuscript evidence is highly complicated, and

[1] Ecclesiam principalem unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est (*Ep.* LIX 14). Note the perfect tense *exorta est*. He does not say that unity *now* flows from Rome, but that it began historically with Peter and his episcopate.

[2] Koch raises the question whether Cyprian is guilty of circular reasoning here, but dismisses it, airily enough, by adding: 'Allein es hat eben noch nie eine Dogmatik ohne Zirkel gegeben' (l.c. p. 88).

for a full account of it the reader should consult Dom Chapman's careful articles on the subject in the *Revue Bénédictine* for 1902 and 1903. The details do not here concern us, and it is sufficient to say that certain manuscripts (although not the oldest) of Cyprian's *de unitate* bear witness to a version of c. 4 which differs remarkably from the authentic or received text that has been printed above. According to this secondary or alternative text, Cyprian presented his argument in the following terms:

'The Lord speaketh to Peter and saith, *I say unto thee that thou art Peter*, etc. And after His resurrection He saith to him *Feed my sheep*. Upon him he builds the Church, and to him He commends His sheep to be fed; and although he assigns equal power to all the apostles, yet He constituted One Chair and ordained by His own authority the source and system of unity. Certainly the others were what Peter was, but the primacy is given to Peter, and both Church and Chair are shewn to be one. And all are shepherds, but one flock is indicated which is fed by all the apostles with an unanimous consent. Does he who holds not this unity of the Church believe that he holds the faith? Is he, who deserts the Chair of Peter, upon whom the Church was built, confident that he is in the Church[1]?'

The most remarkable feature of the manuscripts

[1] Loquitur Dominus ad Petrum 'ego tibi dico' etc. Et *eidem post resurrectionem suam dicit* 'Pasce oues meas.' Super *illum* aedificat ecclesiam et *illi pascendas oues mandat*, et quamuis apostolis omnibus parem tribuat potestatem *unam tamen cathedram constituit* et unitatis originem *atque rationem* sua auctoritate disposuit. Hoc erant utique ceteri quod fuit Petrus, sed *primatus Petro datur*, et una ecclesia et cathedra una monstratur. *Et pastores sunt omnes, sed grex unus ostenditur, qui ab apostolis omnibus unanimi consensione pascatur.* Hanc ecclesiae unitatem qui non tenet, tenere se fidem credit? Qui *cathedram Petri* super quem fundata ecclesia est *deserit*, in ecclesia se esse confidit? This is the text of the alternative version, as finally reached by Dom Chapman and printed in the *Revue Bénédictine*, 1903, p. 40. The words here placed in italics do not appear in the authoritative text (see p. 246 above).

presenting this version is that in the best and earliest of them it is *followed* by the received or authoritative text, the ground being thus traversed twice. This composite or conflate text is certainly not original, and accordingly many scholars have concluded that the alternative is a mere forgery, foisted into the *de unitate* in the interests of the Papal claims. Archbishop Benson may be mentioned as one of the most vigorous among the modern supporters of this view[1]. But the thorough examination of the manuscripts undertaken by Dom Chapman makes it plain that the secondary or alternative version can be traced back a very long way—in his opinion as early as the third century. Chapman, indeed, has proposed the interesting theory that *both* versions of the text are due to Cyprian himself, the first being published in the earliest drafts of the *de unitate* which (according to Chapman) was composed with a view to the troubles caused at Carthage by Felicissimus, while the alternative version was substituted in the second edition of the treatise, as the schism caused at Rome by Novatian was then Cyprian's chief anxiety. Harnack has accepted the force of Chapman's reasoning[2], and agrees that the interpolated or alternative version was directed against Novatian and that its language is not inconsistent with Cyprian's style. Batiffol, on the other hand, while accepting the passage as Cyprianic, will not allow that it was composed with Novatian in view, and prefers to regard the later draft as the authoritative text. The precariousness of reasoning based solely on internal evidence is well illustrated by this divergence of view.

The difficulty of accepting the disputed or alternative text as Cyprian's is simply this, that *prima facie* its argument is quite unlike anything which Cyprian says elsewhere. At two points especially it has not the

[1] Benson *Cyprian* pp. 200 ff., 549 ff.
[2] See *Theol. Literaturzeitung* 1903 p. 263 ff.

true Cyprianic ring. First, the argument that the significance of Matt. xvi 18 depends on the fact that the Church is built on *one* man is absent, and in its place is substituted the wholly different argument that the Lord's words indicate a peculiar authority for Peter personally, and for the see of Peter. It is one of the peculiarities of Cyprian's exposition, often repeated, of the Lord's promise to Peter, that he does not take this line, and it is highly suspicious that such an exegesis should be found here and here only in the writings ascribed to him. And, secondly, the assertion made at the close that whoever deserts the see of Peter deserts the Church of Christ, is an assertion which it would have been wholly inconsistent for Cyprian to have made, at any stage of his career. His unchanging doctrine is that the unity of the Church is to be found in the consensus of the collective episcopate, and not necessarily in communion with the Roman See. Despite the care that has been taken by the author of the 'interpolation' to use phrases of Cyprianic origin, the tenor of the argument is so unlike Cyprian's general teaching that internal evidence concurs with manuscript authority in rejecting the whole passage. It is quite unnecessary to speak of 'forgery,' as if we were dealing with a modern document. The probability is that the alternative version, which was at some time or other suggested in the margin of a manuscript, as explanatory or as an improvement, was interpolated in the text without any dishonest intention. But, however it may have originated, it ought not now to be regarded as part of Cyprian's true text[1].

We return now to Cyprian's doctrine of Unity. To his mind, as we have seen, the unity of the Church is exhibited by the unity of the collective episcopate.

[1] This is the view of Koch (l.c. p. 159), who will not allow that the interpolation has any claim to be counted as Cyprianic.

The growing practice of summoning Councils of bishops to consider vexed questions helped to foster the sense of unity, and to keep before the mind of the faithful the vision of the Catholic Church, wider and freer than the local Christian community over which each several bishop presided. And the practice tended also to emphasize the authority and responsibility of the episcopate. For no one except a bishop had a vote or a share in the decision that was the outcome of the conciliar deliberations. No public act of the bishop exhibited his authority more definitely than his vote at an episcopal Council, solemnly recorded, and recognized by all to be binding upon the lay people, as well as upon the clergy, within his jurisdiction. And inasmuch as the decisions that were promulgated were often unanimous and always, in practice, the decisions of an overwhelming majority, the unity of the Church was shewn forth in a way that the simplest could understand by the unity of the bishops assembled in council—the symbol of the larger unity of the bishops throughout the Christian world.

This unity was not inconsistent, to be sure, with local variety of usage, such as the difference of the date of Easter at Jerusalem and at Rome[1]; nor with some divergence as to penitential discipline. As to such matters each bishop was his own ordinary[2]. This principle of freedom was laid down with special emphasis when the difficulty as to the rebaptism of heretics came before the Seventh Council of Carthage; and the synodical statement of each bishop's liberty to decide it, as he judged best—although their judgement in council had been unanimous—has been already quoted. The decision of this question is intimately connected with the doctrine of the Church's ministry,

[1] In ceteris quoque plurimis prouinciis multa pro locorum et hominum diuersitate uariantur (*Ep.* LXXV 6).

[2] See above p. 240 f.

and Cyprian's arguments on the subject bring into clear relief the position which, in his view, the Church's ministers were bound to claim for themselves.

VIII

The first allusion in Christian literature to the qualifications of the minister of baptism[1] is in Ignatius: 'It is not lawful,' he says, 'without the bishop to baptize[2].' In early times, the rite was administered, as far as was practicable, by the bishop himself, and baptisms were generally reserved for stated times, such as Easter and Pentecost, when the bishop could be present. If others performed the rite, it was avowedly as the bishop's delegates and with his authority[3]. We have already seen that Tertullian enunciates this principle[4], and it will be noticed that it is quite consistent with the recognition of *lay* baptism, while it rules out *heretical* baptism. A layman may have the bishop's sanction, explicit or implicit, to baptize in a case of emergency; but this could not be claimed by a heretic, who is outside the Church's fold. It would seem, indeed, that the Eastern Church did not recognize lay baptism before the third century; but, however that may be, it is undoubted that it was prone to repudiate heretical baptism, i.e. baptism administered by heretical persons. The most dangerous heresies which Christendom had to face arose in the East, and Eastern discipline in regard to heretics has always been more rigorous than in the West.

[1] Elwin *The Minister of Baptism* (1889) provides a convenient and lucid summary of the history of the matter.

[2] *οὐκ ἐξόν ἐστιν χωρὶς τοῦ ἐπισκόπου οὔτε βαπτίζειν οὔτε ἀγάπην ποιεῖν* (*Smyrn.* 8, where Lightfoot's note gives many parallels).

[3] Even as late as Jerome this is explicitly recognized: 'sine chrismate et episcopi iussione neque presbyter neque diaconus ius habeant baptizandi' (*c. Lucif.* 9).

[4] p. 223 above.

In the matter of heretical baptism, Eastern theologians and Councils have been most explicit. In the second century, Clement of Alexandria—no rigorist ecclesiastic but a largehearted and liberal scholar—says that 'heretical baptism is not counted proper water[1].' The Council of Iconium laid down in 231 that heretical baptism was invalid. Firmilian, bishop of Caesarea, was present, and he described its proceedings in a letter still extant which he addressed to Cyprian. Heretics, he says, have separated themselves from the Church which is the home of grace, and have therefore lost all power of ministering grace. And Firmilian added that the Council believed their decision to rest on the practice of the Church from the apostolic age. 'Nor do we remember that this ever had a beginning among us, since it has ever been observed here, that we know only of one Church of God, and account holy baptism to be only of the holy Church[2].' Dionysius of Alexandria bears like witness to the antiquity of the custom of baptizing converts from heresy[3].

In Africa the rule was not so strictly observed[4], but nevertheless it had been the rule. Tertullian refused, with his customary vehemence, to admit that heretical baptism could be valid: 'we and they have not the same God nor the same Christ[5].' But it is more significant that a Council of bishops held at Carthage under the presidency of Agrippinus about the year 213 formally decided that baptism by heretics should be treated as null and void. This was the precedent to which Cyprian afterwards appealed, but it is plain that

[1] τὸ βάπτισμα τὸ αἱρετικὸν οὐκ οἰκεῖον καὶ γνήσιον ὕδωρ λογιζομένη (sc. ἡ σοφία) (*Strom.* I XIX, interpreting a LXX reading of Prov. ix 18).

[2] *Ep.* LXXV 19.

[3] Eus. *H.E.* VII 7.

[4] See Augustine *de bapt.* III V 7.

[5] *De bapt.* XV. This is a Montanist treatise, and belongs to the later period of Tertullian's life.

he had also behind him the tradition of the Eastern Church.

On the other hand, the Roman Church had always taken the laxer, or more liberal, view that baptism, by whomsoever administered, if in the Name of the Holy Trinity, should not be repeated. Cyprian could not deny that the Roman tradition was against him, but he pleaded that reason, not custom, should be invoked to determine so grave a matter[1]. He laid down his fundamental principle on the subject in the *de unitate* and declared that there could be only *one* baptism, viz. that of the Church[2]. Three successive Councils of Carthage in 255 and 256 under his presidency considered the question, which had then become urgent because of the growth of the Novatianist schism, and decided formally (by a unanimous vote in the case of the two later Councils) that they could not recognize heretical baptism in any way[3]. With this decision Firmilian expressed his entire concurrence[4], and thus the attempt of Pope Stephen to force the laxer practice of the West upon the East failed of success.

It will be clear from this survey that Cyprian's policy in regard to rebaptism was no new policy. It was that of the whole Eastern Church, as it is still[5]; and it had its roots, so far as Carthage was concerned, in the early practice which the Council under Agrippinus had revived forty years before. But the doctrine that heretical baptism is null and void, though not peculiar to Cyprian nor beginning with him, has had no more powerful exponent than he; and the arguments upon

[1] *Ep.* LXXI 3.

[2] *De unit.* 11.

[3] The decisions of the first two Councils are set out in *Epp.* LXX, LXXII; and the several judgements of the 87 bishops present at the third Council have been preserved in full.

[4] *Ep.* LXXV 7.

[5] The Eastern Church is committed by the Quini-sext Council of 691 to the decree of the Council of Carthage of 256.

which he relied go back to first principles of grave importance.

If we may use the language of a later age to express the difference between Cyprian and his opponents as to the question of baptism, it may be said that the Africans rejected, while the Romans recognized (implicitly, although not avowedly), the idea of sacramental grace *ex opere operato*[1]. Something more was required than the 'matter' and 'form' appropriate to the sacrament of baptism, if the recipient were to claim a heavenly benediction therein. The sacrament must be sought through the orderly and regular channels appointed originally by Christ for the refreshment of His Church. That is, it must be sought through the bishop or his deputy. This is the conviction which is behind all Cyprian's reasoning, as will be seen if we go through his arguments in detail.

The Church is One. That is his master thought. There is a diversity, to be sure, in this unity. The rays of the sun are various, while its light is one. The vine has many branches, but they all spring from one root. Yet the Church is undivided, like the seamless robe of Christ. It is like the ark which was the one place of safety[2]. In its definite exclusiveness it is like the enclosed garden and the sealed fountain of the Song of Solomon[3]. And, as there is only one Church, so there can only be one Baptism. Baptism cannot be outside the Church[4]. This Cyprian holds to be matter of revelation: 'it has been delivered to us that there is one God...and one Church, and one Baptism appointed only in the one Church[5].'

This one Church, as we have seen, is for Cyprian the Church which is governed by the bishops who hold

[1] See Koch l.c. p. 156.
[2] *De unit.* 5—7.
[3] *Ep.* LXXIV 11.
[4] Esse baptisma praeter ecclesiam non potest (*Ep.* LXXI 1).
[5] *Ep.* LXXIV 11.

their sees by lawful succession and due consecration. 'We know only one Christ and one Church of His... can anyone who is not in the Church give water from the Church's fountains?...It is we (the bishops) who by Divine permission[1] water the thirsty people of God[2].' For the bishop is essential to the Church, and the guardian of its sacred fountains. The consecration of the Font is peculiarly his office[3]; and it is only as his delegate that anyone else may baptize.

Again, Cyprian asks, 'How can a man give that which he does not possess?' A heretic has not the Holy Spirit; how then can he give the Holy Spirit to another? Baptism is 'for the remission of sins,' and sins can only be remitted by those who have the Holy Spirit, as the Lord's words to the apostles after His resurrection indicate[4]. The baptismal interrogatory 'Dost thou believe in remission of sins through the holy Church[5]?' shews of itself that remission is not given except through the Church, to which heretics do not belong. Their baptism, therefore, must be counted null[6].

Or, it may be urged that as there is only one faith, there is only one baptism. 'If the baptism of heretics be identical with ours, then our faith must be the same[7],' which we know is not the case. 'Baptism cannot be common to us and to the heretics, with whom we have in common neither God the Father, nor Christ the Son, nor the Holy Spirit, nor faith, nor the Church itself[8].' A mere invocation of the sacred Names cannot be efficacious without faith, and a true faith[9].

[1] It is interesting to note the phrase, still preserved in the style of a modern bishop.

[2] *Ep.* LXXIII 10, 11.

[3] Oportet uero mundari et sanctificari aquam prius a sacerdote, ut possit baptismo suo peccata hominis qui baptizatur abluere (*Ep.* LXX 1).

[4] *Ep.* LXIX 11; cp. John XX 23.

[5] This was the African form of the Creed.

[6] *Ep.* LXX 2, 3. [7] *Ep.* LXXV 25. [8] *Ep.* LXXIII 21. [9] *Ep.* LXXV 9.

Here, indeed, in Cyprian's thought, is no trifling issue. For if the baptism of heretics be recognized, they will claim that they have a Church and the Church's gifts[1]. When he is pressed by the text 'When two or three are gathered together in My Name, there I am in the midst of them,' he can only answer that it is impossible that any can be gathered in Christ's Name who are separated from Christ's rule and Christ's gospel, and that it is only of those within the Church that the Lord spoke[2]. Christian history makes it increasingly difficult for those born in a later age thus to set aside the tokens of Christian grace among men and women who are undoubtedly separated from the historic Church of Christ's appointment; it would not be easy now to find an apologist for Cyprian's dictum that those who are not in this Church may be counted among the spiritually dead[3]. But for Cyprian and his contemporaries, to whom the progress of heresy meant the disruption of the Church and the rejection of the Christian revelation, it was not conceivable that the grace of Christ could be found outside the one Catholic fold of the Church historically continuous with that of the apostles, through its unbroken succession of bishops.

The arguments of Cyprian did not prevail to govern the policy of the Western Church. Stephen, the bishop of Rome, against whose latitudinarian weakness (as he deemed it) Cyprian inveighed, was the truer interpreter of the Church's mind. Cyprian made of baptism a rite which can only be expected to evoke a heavenly blessing, if it be ministered by one who belongs to the orthodox Church. But the Western Church, at any rate, refused to narrow its boundaries

[1] *Ep.* LXXIII 24. [2] *De unit.* 12.

[3] It is thus that he expounds the 'baptism by the dead' of Ecclus. xxxi 30: 'manifestum est eos qui non sunt in ecclesia Christi inter mortuos conputari' (*Ep.* LXXI 1).

on such a principle. Archbishop Benson describes this as Cyprian's 'unforeseen contribution to Donatism, the invalidation of an ecclesiastical act on account of subjective imperfection in the minister[1].' But it will be observed that to Cyprian's thought, it is not the wrong *intention* of the minister that is significant; it is his inherent disability to pass on what he does not himself possess. Nor does he raise the difficulty that emerges if the minister happens to be a man of orthodox profession, but of bad character and immoral conversation. That would not invalidate a sacramental act, performed by him, on Cyprian's principles. Whether he is a worthy or unworthy officer of the Church, yet if he is *within* the Church, and duly authorized to minister in the Church's name, his act is valid. But if he is without the Church at the time when he attempts so to minister, his ministration is null. Cyprian is not content to call such ministration irregular rather than null, for in his view that which is ecclesiastically irregular, in the sense that it is a departure from the Church's rule, is wholly invalid.

Nevertheless, Cyprian would not break communion with those who recognized heretical baptism. They were wrong, as he believed, and wrong upon a point which concerns the extent and boundaries of the Church. He uses strong language about the impiety of their decision. But 'saluo iure communionis diuersa sentire' is his maxim. There may be diversity within the unity of the Church, which he finds symbolized in the moral unity of the whole College of Christian bishops. The sacrament of the Eucharist may be shared, to his thinking, with those who are willing to offer it to persons not validly baptized. The breadth of his charity refused to be bound by the logical fetters which he had forged for himself. It

[1] *Cyprian* p. 521.

was not Cyprian, but another bishop who proposed at the Seventh Council of Carthage the far reaching question, Can we recognize heretical baptisms and refuse to recognize heretical eucharists[1]?

IX

No attempt has been made in this short study either to defend or to assail Cyprian's doctrine of the Christian Ministry. My purpose has been wholly expository and historical, and therefore I have thought it best to give Cyprian's teaching as far as possible in his own words. His writings form a chapter in Christian literature which cannot be ignored if we are to form a true estimate of the developement of Christian doctrine in the second and third centuries. We cannot drop him out of the Christian tradition merely because his teachings happen to be inconvenient[2]. His attitude to Rome is not that of the Western Church in the Middle Ages. But it has a lesson for later times. His attitude to unauthorized or irregular ministries is not that of modern Liberalism. The African Church was very stiff and unyielding in Cyprian's day and in that of his predecessors. The Montanists at Carthage broke away from it in search of a freer, and (as they supposed) a more spiritual religion. But history has proved the inadequacy of Montanism in any of its phases, ancient or modern, to preserve the Christian faith or to maintain the Christian life. No writer of early days more clearly shews that to be Catholic is not necessarily to be Roman, and that Christian charity is not inconsistent with an unhesitating acceptance of the discipline of the Christian Church.

[1] Qui haereticorum baptismum probat quid aliud quam haereticis communicat? (*Sent. episc.* 20).

[2] Cf. Koch l.c. p. 144.

ESSAY V

EARLY FORMS OF ORDINATION

W. H. FRERE, D.D.

SUMMARY

I. The evidence of the New Testament as to services of ordination.

II. The evidence in the early Church Orders is derived ultimately from two tracts, originally belonging to the beginning of the third century, but existing in later modified forms also.

III. The argument of the tract 'Concerning Spiritual Gifts' against the Montanists, and its implications.

IV. The consecration of a bishop as shewn by the tract 'Concerning Ordinations': his position in relation to the presbyterate as evidenced by the rite, and the consecratory prayer, as interpreted in accordance with the *Canons of Hippolytus*. Subsequent modifications in the Church Orders, and their significance.

V. The ordination of a presbyter according to the original tract; and a rival interpretation advanced, which discredits the *Canons of Hippolytus*, and concludes that the presbyter had originally a consecratory prayer of his own.

VI. The views about the ministry to be found in the section which deals with the ordination of a deacon.

VII. The hierarchical position originally assigned to two classes of 'confessors', and the modifications introduced in later forms of the tract. Confirmatory evidence from other documents. No such position is assigned to the prophet. The importance of this fact in the controversy of those days and of our own. But 'liberty of prophesying' is reserved to the bishop in solemn liturgical acts.

VIII. The position of the lesser orders of the ministry in this tract, and the alterations introduced subsequently.

IX. The ordination prayers in the Sacramentary of Sarapion.

X. Some scattered pieces of patristic evidence collected, concerning election, appointment, and qualifications.

XI. Collateral evidence concerning the differentiation of the bishop and the presbyter through a development in the function of each.

XII. Concerning the lesser ranks of the ministry, their number and gradation.

XIII. The conception of ordination which lies behind these services.

V

EARLY FORMS OF ORDINATION

I

The Christian literature which has come down to us from ante-Nicene days gives scanty information as to the rites of ordination. The evidence in the New Testament is not extensive. In the subsequent patristic literature, apart from the Church Orders and the kindred documents of the third and fourth centuries, there is very little direct evidence available. Some students indeed, regarding the Pastoral Epistles as the earliest of a series of pseudo-apostolic Church Orders[1], would thereupon say, that only in the series of Church Orders had any early indication of the nature of these rites survived. But this view does not seem justified.

We will therefore begin by dealing in the first place with the biblical evidence, and especially that which comes from the Pastoral Epistles. In other parts of the New Testament there is mention of prayer accompanied by the imposition of hands: but neither of these, nor yet the conjunction of the two, is peculiar to ordination. The well-known passages in the Pastoral Epistles carry the enquiry a little way further forward, particularly I Tim. iv 14, which mentions the Gift given through prophecy[2] with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery. This, read in conjunction with the

[1] As does E. Schwartz in his tract *Über die pseudoapostolischen Kirchenordnungen* (Strassburg, 1910) p. 1 note 1.

[2] *μὴ ἀμέλει τοῦ ἐν σοὶ χαρίσματος, ὃ ἐδόθη σοι διὰ προφητείας μετὰ ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν τοῦ πρεσβυτερίου.* Cp. i 18 *κατὰ τὰς προαγούσας ἐπὶ σὲ προφητείας.*

phrase in II Tim. i 6, 'the Gift of God, which is in thee by the putting on of my hands[1],' establishes the practice, familiar thenceforward wherever evidence is available, of ordination by one presiding authority, with the cooperation of others, in the case of the higher grades of the ministry. Similarly the injunction to Timothy in I Tim. v 22[2] (if it refers to ordination), read in conjunction with Tit. i 5[3], suggests that the imposition of hands continued to form part of ordination in the practice of the subapostolic generation. Thenceforward χειροτονεῖν and χειροθετεῖν become technical terms of ordination. Strictly speaking, the one applied to the act of election, and the other to the act of ordination; but they were soon confused and interchanged both by copyists and by authors themselves. The former is the word used of the appointment of Elders during the first Missionary journey in Acts xiv 23, indicating probably appointment rather than ordination[4].

The preliminaries of the act of ordination, such as election and approbation, have also their roots in the New Testament. In the case of the Seven, the ordination was preceded by an enquiry into qualifications, an election, and a presentation of the candidates. In the case of St Matthias the procedure was similar but necessarily different (Acts vi 3—6: i 21—26). A considerable place is given in the Pastoral Epistles to a definition of the qualifications necessary for the ministry. This seems to have regard more to the approbation by the ordaining officer than to the election by the Church in general. But the one does not exclude

[1] ἀναζωπυρεῖν τὸ χάρισμα τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὅ ἐστιν ἐν σοὶ διὰ τῆς ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν μου.

[2] χεῖρας ταχέως μηδενὶ ἐπιτίθει.

[3] τούτου χάριν ἀπέλιπόν σε ἐν Κρήτῃ, ἵνα...καταστήσῃς κατὰ πόλιν πρεσβυτέρους, ὡς ἐγώ σοι διεταξάμην.

[4] Cp. II Cor. viii 19 of a church delegate, chosen for a mission of charity: χειροτονηθεὶς ὑπὸ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν, συνέκδημος ἡμῶν ἐν τῇ χάριτι ταύτῃ.

the other: and presumably some form of election remained a preliminary step, as in the case of the Seven. The qualifications of the episcopus are described in I Tim. iii 1—7: and again in Tit. i 5—9 the like is set down for the presbyter-episcopus. The qualifications for the deacon follow in I Tim. iii 8—13. In a separate connexion the ideals of other Christian states are described, but none of these seems to have any technical connotation unless it be that of the Widows (I Tim. v 3—16). These are to have a special scrutiny in view of their being entered on the roll of the Church. For the moment, this seems to imply a purely eleemosynary not a hierarchical position. But in view of the dignity to which in later days the church Widows grew, this beginning must be noted.

It is possible also that we may discern traces of a rival and schismatical ministry in the Pastoral Epistles. Hymenaeus and Alexander in I Tim. i 20 stand opposed to Timothy, who has his charge in virtue of the 'prophecies which went before on him.' The breach that has come about certainly involves difference of doctrine: but, in view of this reference to Timothy's own ordination, the passage may imply a breach in order and discipline also. Similarly in the Second Epistle opponents are mentioned: and they are not merely rival teachers, but, like Jannes and Jambres who resisted Moses, they seem to be leading a rival party. And this obscure allusion to the Egyptian magi becomes a *locus classicus* in later Christian writing. We shall meet it again shortly in a description of false prophets as contrasted with the true hierarchy of the Church.

Thus the New Testament, while it provides little of detail, gives the principles which are to be followed both in the preliminaries leading up to ordination and in the service itself.

In the Apostolic Fathers and in the second century there is nothing to be found in the way of formal

ordination services. There are not even any descriptions of a service, such as Justin has sketched for the Eucharist and for Baptism. Only some scattered allusions and bits of information are forthcoming. It will be best to postpone these, till we have considered such documents of a definitely liturgical character as are available.

II

We come then to the group of documents which may be roughly described by the term 'Church Orders[1].' Here we find on enquiry better evidence than might have been expected at first sight. There is imbedded in this puzzling heap of literature a pair of early documents, one of which is professedly concerned with ordinations, while the other, which precedes it, is a very brief treatise on *Charismata*, or Spiritual Gifts[2]. In its original form this closely linked pair of tracts seems to owe its origin to the fight of the Catholic Church against Montanism : and in that case it dates from the close of the second century or the opening of the third. It is quite possible that the two tracts are the work of Hippolytus, that mysterious figure which stands out conspicuous in the midst of strife, schism, and martyrdom at Rome in the first third of the third century. He is known to have written against Montanism, and to have written a work which had for title 'Concerning Spiritual Gifts,'—a title which has survived in close and constant connexion with the first of these two tracts in the form in which it has come down to us. There are also other features of the tracts which correspond with what we know of Hippolytus. Moreover in some

[1] For the subject in general, see Maclean *Ancient Church Orders* (Cambridge, 1910), and for those that are utilized in this essay see a comparative table printed below at p. 311.

[2] The writer has attempted, in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, xvi 323—371 (April 1915), to do the preliminary critical work of disentangling these two documents, and is here summarizing and simplifying the results there attained.

of the sources his name is connected with one or another of the many forms in which the second tract, 'Concerning Ordinations,' appears; so that this may be provisionally identified with the lost work of his called 'The Apostolic Tradition.'

It is not necessary to press the question of authorship. In any case these tracts seem to belong to the age of Hippolytus: and the point of date is more important than that of authorship, so far as our present task is concerned. No doubt it would be a gain if they could be conclusively proved to be Hippolytean, especially as they would then be known as coming from Rome. But it will be best to be on the safe side, and to treat both authorship and provenance as doubtful.

In so far as it is possible to recover these two little treatises in their original form, from the compilations in which they have been successively embedded, we shall have evidence of ordination services belonging to the beginning of the third century. But further, since we have modified forms of the tract 'Concerning Ordinations,' extending down beyond the end of the fourth century, we may also hope to see, at least along one line of developement, something of the changes which went on during the century and a half subsequent to the original composition of this treatise.

In order to justify what has been already said with regard to the two tracts, and to explain in detail this developement of the ordination rites which is traceable in the successive forms of the second of the two, it will be necessary (*a*) to describe briefly the different compilations into which the two tracts have been incorporated; (*b*) to state (at least provisionally) the sequence of the modifications which the tracts have undergone; and (*c*) to provide a convenient nomenclature for our purpose.

We are not concerned with the dates or sequence of the compilations themselves, but only with a different and a simpler matter, viz. the dates and sequence of

those parts of the compilations which are derived from the two little tracts.

Confining ourselves therefore to this, we may say that the developement of the ordination rites may be studied in four stages, each of them corresponding with a document or group of documents to be found in these compilations. The first stage corresponds with a document which may be called 'The First Church Order,' now existing in several versions of a (presumably Greek) directory. This First Church Order is itself a compilation, which begins by incorporating the tract 'Concerning Ordinations,' and then goes on to deal with other matters than ordination, drawing its material from other, and less recognizable, sources. The First Church Order was combined later on with other documents in a manual of church law commonly called *The Statutes of the Apostles*. Versions of this exist in Coptic (Sahidic and Bohairic), in Arabic, in Ethiopic, and (in part) in Latin. This later compilation comprised three main elements—(i) The Apostolic Church Order; (ii) the First Church Order, which we have in consideration; and (iii) a further remodelling of the same material in another form which will shortly be described as 'A Second Church Order.'

A second stage of the developement of the ordination rites corresponds with the so-called *Canons of Hippolytus*. This is another manual of church law, only known now as part of an Arabic compilation; it utilized the tract 'Concerning Ordinations' for its earlier sections: and then passed on to other material.

A third stage of developement corresponds with a large group of documents, of which the most conspicuous items are two Greek sources, the *Constitutions by Hippolytus* and the 8th Book of the *Apostolic Constitutions*. The earlier sections of both these Greek documents form part of the group. It also contains, in several oriental versions, that further remodelling of the

First Church Order which has been already mentioned as forming the third part of the compilation called *The Statutes of the Apostles*. The shape in which our two tracts appear in the documents of this whole group may be described by the general term 'A Second Church Order.'

The fourth stage corresponds with a single document, which stands somewhat alone and apart, viz. *The Testament of our Lord*.

These stages are probably not derived directly one from another; but, so far as can be learnt from our surviving documents, they are to be regarded as representing some of the successive handlings of the same or similar material.

There lie behind our immediate enquiry two somewhat intricate tasks: first to marshal all the material and to trace the sequence of the documents: and secondly to work back behind the existing forms to the original state of the two treatises. These tasks the present writer has attempted, as has been said (p. 268 n. 2), elsewhere. Among the results then attained the following are of present importance. As regards the tract 'Concerning Ordinations':

(1) It consisted probably of a set of six chapters preceded by a transitional passage linking it to the preceding tract 'Concerning Spiritual Gifts.'

(2) The subjects included there were the services for the ordination of 1. Bishops: 2. Presbyters: 3. Deacons: 4. Confessors: 5. Widows: 6. Readers, virgins, subdeacons and healers.

(3) The successive forms, which the tract has since taken, shew by their agreement what was original; and by their divergences they separate off the secondary material which did not belong to the original.

The case of the tract 'Concerning Spiritual Gifts,' which precedes the other, is less intricate but more insecure, since it is preserved only in the third stage,—the Second Church Order. As found there, it consists

only of two sections and a modified form of the transitional passage above mentioned. In the absence of any documentary evidence belonging to the first two stages it is difficult to control what we have, or to say how much represents the original tract: much certainly is due to the compiler.

III

These two closely linked tracts—'Concerning Spiritual Gifts' and 'Concerning Ordinations'—had, as we have noted, a polemical purpose. This is clearly defined in the former of the two, as a brief analysis will shew.

The author tells those who have special gifts not to boast themselves against those who have the ordinary spiritual gifts of the Christian, nor yet against those who have the special gifts of the ministry. Spiritual gifts of an exceptional kind are of value for the unbeliever rather than for the Christian. The ordinary gifts are the more important. No greater sign is ever given of the possession of a spiritual gift than when a heathen accepts the faith of Christ. All Christian belief therefore is charismatic. Similarly the prophet or wonder-worker has no doubt his proper gift; but it is not greater than that which the Holy Spirit gives for the ministry. The true prophet is shewn by his modesty, for he must know, just as the member of the hierarchy knows, that only by the gift of God is he what he is. Besides, this prophecy, about which some are boasting, is no new thing. The Church has all along had its prophets and has them still. Only it distinguishes necessarily between true prophecy and false. There has always been false prophecy side by side with true prophecy, from the days of Jannes and Jambres down to those of Caiaphas: and since that period too. Nor does the Church repudiate the idea of a female prophet: for its own tradition recognizes examples under both Covenants. But let the truth of the claim to special gifts be shewn by modesty.

The meaning of all this is clear, when we consider what claims Montanism had set up. It gave to the prophet the power to absolve[1], and apparently, at any rate in the East, allowed a woman to celebrate the Eucharist[2]. It thus had a new hierarchy, a succession of prophets, which was derived, no doubt, from the new revelation, and rejected, or at least depreciated, the catholic hierarchy and its apostolic tradition[3].

All these claims to a new revelation and, in particular, to a superior kind of ministry, made on the part of the prophets and wonder-workers, are treated by the catholic apologist as a novelty: and probably the claimants regarded them as such. There is no question here of an ancient 'charismatic ministry' lingering on from older days, and being gradually discredited. The theory postulating a primitive ministry of prophets and teachers, which acquired considerable popularity in the end of the nineteenth century after the discovery of the *Didache*, like the similar theory which was advocated in the sixteenth century, finds no confirmation here, but rather the reverse. The writer's line is to argue that the whole apostolical tradition[4] is against these novel claims. To many (he says in his prologue) that tradition is well known, and they only need to be reassured about it in view of the novel errors: but for the benefit of others who may not know what the tradition involves, the author will expound its details in the following treatise[5].

[1] Euseb. *H.E.* v 18 § 7: Tertullian *De pud.* 21.

[2] Firmilian *apud* Cypr. *Ep.* LXXV 10. Epiphanius (*Haer.* XLIX 2) speaks of female priests and bishops among the Quintilianists.

[3] See for these points Dr Lawlor's article in *Journ. Theol. Studies* (July 1908) IX 489 and ff. (reprinted in his *Eusebiana*, 1912, pp. 119 ff.); Labriolle *La Crise Montaniste* and *Les Sources de l'histoire du Montanisme* (both 1913).

[4] The phrase 'Apostolic Tradition' is the sub-title of the Hippolytean tracts, or perhaps a separate title for the second treatise.

[5] Ut hii qui bene docti sunt eam quae permansit usque nunc traditionem, exponentibus nobis, custodiant; et agnoscentes, firmiores maneant propter eum, qui nuper inventus est per ignorantiam, lapsus vel error... praestante sancto Spiritu perfectam gratiam eis qui recte credunt, ut cognoscant quomodo oportet tradi et custodiri omnia eos qui ecclesiae

Then those who have the right belief will also, by the grace of the Holy Spirit, have the right tradition, and will know how it is to be carried on by the rulers of the Church.

Thus the doctrine of the Ministry that underlies both the tracts is that it is an ordinance which is handed on as well as a ministry of divine grace. There is no false antithesis between a charismatic and a traditional Ministry: spiritual gift and apostolic transmission are united in it.

IV

The principle is thus laid down as being clear, old-established, and of a permanent character. When we turn to scrutinize the actual form which the hierarchy takes in the tract 'Concerning Ordinations,' we find that it is primitive in some respects, while in other respects perhaps it has already begun to shift[1].

The bishop is elected by all and consecrated on a Sunday by several bishops. The earliest authorities, taken jointly, seem to imply that the consecration prayer of a bishop is used also for a presbyter. This sounds improbable. Assuming, however, for the moment, that this is the case[2] (though another view will be put forward later on), we note that even so

praesunt: see this passage, connecting the two tracts according to the Latin version, Hauler *Didascaliae Apostolorum Fragmenta* (1900), pp. 101, 103.

[1] It will be well to give the text from the Latin version of the First Church Order, which probably lies nearest to the original (Hauler p. 103). Episcopus ordinetur, electus ab omni populo: quique cum nominatus fuerit et placuerit omnibus, conveniet populus, una cum praesbyterio et his qui praesentes fuerint episcopi, die dominica. Consentientibus omnibus, imponant super eum manus, et praesbyterium adstet quiescens. Omnes autem silentium habeant, orantes in corde propter descensionem Spiritus. Ex quibus unus de praesentibus episcopis, ab omnibus rogatus, imponens manum ei qui ordinatur episcopus, oret ita dicens.

[2] Again it will be well to quote the Latin version of the First Church Order (p. 108). Cum autem praesbyter ordinatur, imponat manum super caput eius episcopus, contingentibus etiam praesbyteris; et dicat secundum ea quae praedicta sunt, sicut praediximus super episcopum. A different prayer follows, which, on the present assumption, is to be regarded as a later addition.

the distinction between bishop and presbyter cannot, in fact, fail to be clearly visible at any ordination service. If a bishop is being ordained, there are several consecrators, and only the bishops lay on hands: the presbyters stand by. If a presbyter is ordained, there is but one bishop who officiates and lays on his hand, and the presbyters seem, as of old, to be joining in the laying on of hands, or, in some way at least, to be co-operating with the bishop[1].

At the laying on of hands by all the bishops jointly, no words are said aloud, but all join in silent prayer for the descent of the Holy Spirit. There is a second imposition of the hand subsequently performed by the presiding bishop: and this is accompanied by the recitation of the consecration prayer. Such are the directions given in the earliest sources.

Several unexpected points here attract attention. Not only then was an episcopal prayer used at the ordination of a presbyter, but, if he was advanced to the episcopate, presumably the same prayer was repeated. The setting of the service, and the personnel would be different, as we have noted, but there would be no marked difference of rite. This repetition must, one would think, have seemed strange. It may be said that perhaps, in fact, it rarely took place, and that this state of things may point to a set of circumstances in which it was usual for the new bishop to be appointed from among the deacons, rather than from among the presbyters, and to be consecrated *per saltum*.

Again we may wonder what is the significance of the two-fold imposition of hands. It seems to have been thought strange subsequently; for in later stages it is carefully altered: but there seems to be no reason to think that it was not original.

Both these features of the early service fell into disfavour: and alterations took place. In the second

[1] See note 2, p. 274.

stage, represented by the *Canons of Hippolytus*, the identity of rite for the bishop and the presbyter is made more explicit than in the earlier stage; but some explanation, perhaps even some apology for it, is introduced.

> The bishop's prayer shall be said over him entire, except the name 'bishop' only. The bishop is in all respects the equivalent of the presbyter, except in regard to the throne and ordination: because the latter was not given authority to ordain[1].

This theory perhaps also finds expression in another phrase peculiar to this stage. The single officiant who is chosen out for the second imposition of hands is described in the *Canons* as 'one of the bishops and presbyters.' The phrase recalls the situation reached, as regards terminology, in the documents of the New Testament, when there is, as yet, no clear differentiation of the terms. It is interesting to find a trace of the early undifferentiated terminology surviving to so late a date as this, and to find it side by side with the clear differentiation of office and function.

What is the meaning of this survival? Are we to suppose that the old identity of terminology and rite has been retained by a piece of mere conservatism, while, all the time, the real position has been shifting, and a novel distinction has been arising between bishops and presbyters as to office and function? Or are we to suppose that there always was, from apostolic days, the distinction of office and function between the apostles (or their representatives) and the rest of the presbyterate; and that the shifting which takes place is only a shifting of terminology, occasioned by the restriction of the title 'episcopus' to that member of the presbyterate who was distinguished from the rest, by his consecration, and by having the privilege of the throne and the power of ordination? The latter seems the more likely explanation of the two, in view of what has been said and of what follows.

[1] *Canons of Hippolytus*, § 4. Cp. Hieron. *Ep.* CXLVI (ad Evangelum) § 1 Quid enim facit, excepta ordinatione, episcopus, quod presbyter non faciat?

In the *Canons of Hippolytus* it is further stipulated, that, though the same prayer is to be used for the presbyter as for the bishop, the word 'bishop' is not to be used. It is not clear whether this order is an innovation, or merely a desirable reminder of what has always been the case, though not expressly mentioned in the original tractate. In the latter case, the remark would not have any special historical significance: its value would be merely rubrical. But, if the order is an innovation, then the older custom will have been to say the prayer unaltered at the ordination of a presbyter, with all its 'episcopal' phrases unmodified. It is scarcely conceivable that this was so. But, still assuming that it was, in that case we should have two points to notice in this little episode; first another curious survival of the undifferentiated terminology: and secondly a step taken before our eyes in the differentiation of the terms, and the restriction of the term 'episcopus.' We should then be further confirmed in the opinion expressed above, that since the primitive days it is not the essence, but merely the terminology, of the ministry that has been altered.

When we come to the third stage we may be prepared to find that there has been a rebellion against any such plan of using the same prayer to serve for both bishop and presbyter: and that a special prayer has been provided for the presbyter. Such a new prayer is indeed already found in some of the documents of the first stage (the First Church Order): and it reappears, transformed a little by some further process of developement, both in the third and the fourth stages. It will come up again later on, and lead us to a reconsideration of the whole matter.

Next we have to note the disappearance of the twofold imposition of hands. In the original tractate a great deal was made of the preliminary election of the bishop by all the people, which was to be done with

some formality[1]. These preliminaries are further developed in the second stage; there is an acclamation, followed by a space of silence, in which the whole flock are to pray (Ps. lxviii 28)

O God, establish him whom Thou hast prepared for us.

This novelty, thus introduced at this stage, displaces the earlier of the two impositions of hands, i.e. the one made by all the bishops in silence. Consequently only the second of the two, that made by the presiding bishop, remains.

In the third stage these preliminaries are still further magnified until they become a sort of confirmation of the bishop-elect by the assembled bishops. No more is heard of the earlier of the two impositions of hands. Even at the time appointed for the later of the two, the laying on of hands (strangely enough) is now not expressly ordered[2]. The direction for it seems to have dropped out in the course of the modifications which were being introduced at this stage. One of these modifications now lays down, that one presiding bishop with two other bishops is to stand near the altar and say the consecration prayer, while the rest of the bishops and the presbyters pray silently. Another innovation is that the deacons are ordered to hold meanwhile the gospel-book over the head of the candidate. With the first of these points, the stipulation for three bishops instead of one, we are probably brought nearly to Nicene times: and, in the last point, perhaps to merely local custom[3].

The *Testament*, as representing the fourth stage, has little of importance to be recorded, except the fact that

[1] See above, note 1 on p. 274.

[2] The passage in the *Apostolic Constitutions* (VIII iv 6) runs thus: καὶ σιωπῆς γενομένης, εἷς τῶν πρώτων ἐπισκόπων, ἅμα καὶ δυσὶν ἑτέροις πλησίον τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου ἑστώς, τῶν λοιπῶν ἐπισκόπων καὶ πρεσβυτέρων σιωπῇ προσευχομένων, τῶν δὲ διακόνων τὰ θεῖα Εὐαγγέλια ἐπὶ τῆς τοῦ χειροτονουμένου κεφαλῆς ἀνεπτυγμένα κατεχόντων, λεγέτω πρὸς Θεόν.

[3] But see the reference to this ceremony of the gospel-book in Ps.-Dionysius *De Eccl. Hier.* v ii, iii § 1 (*P.G.* III 509).

it keeps both impositions of hands, and adds at the earlier one a formula which the bishops are to say meanwhile.

It is time therefore to return, in order to consider the consecration prayer of the bishop. It is found in all stages, but in a modified form in each of the later stages. At the first stage it is extant in two versions, —Latin and Ethiopic. This form agrees fairly closely with the Greek form given at the third stage in the *Constitutions by Hippolytus*, which is much soberer and shorter than that in the *Apostolic Constitutions*,—the only other document of that stage which gives the prayer. It is probable that the form given in the original tractate was not very far different from this short recension that has come down to us.

It will be a help to the reader to have before him a tentative reconstruction in English of the original prayer.

O God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of mercies and the God of all comfort; who hast thy dwellingplace on high and yet humblest thyself to behold things lowly; who knowest all things before they come to pass; thou hast given the ordinances of the church by the word of thy grace and hast foreordained from the beginning the race of the righteous proceeding from Abraham, appointing rulers and priests, and not leaving thy sanctuary without a ministry; thou who from the foundation of the world hast been pleased to be glorified in those whom thou hast chosen, pour forth now the power, that is from thee, of the free Spirit, which thou gavest to thy beloved servant Jesus Christ, which he bestowed upon the holy apostles who established the church in the place of thy sanctuary, to the glory and unceasing praise of thy name. Thou Father who knowest the hearts of all men, grant to this thy servant, whom thou hast chosen to the episcopate (εἰς ἐπισκοπὴν) that he may feed thy holy flock and execute the highpriesthood unto thee blamelessly ministering night and day; and that he may unceasingly propitiate thy countenance and offer thee the gifts of thy holy church; that he may by the high-priestly spirit (τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἀρχιερατικῷ) have authority to forgive sins according to thy precept, to give forth lots (διδόναι κλήρους) according to thy commandment, and to loose every bond, according to the authority which thou gavest to the apostles: that

2 Cor. i 3
Ps. cxii 5
Susan. 42
Exod. ix 5
Ps. l 12
1 Esdr. viii 75;
2 Esdr. ix 8
Acts i 24
Acts i 20: xx 28
Jo. xx 23
Mark ii 10
Acts i 26
Is. lviii 6
Matt. xvi 19

he may please thee in meekness and in purity of heart, offering thee a sweetsmelling savour: through thy servant Jesus Christ, through whom to thee be glory with him and the Holy Spirit, now and for evermore[1]. Amen.

The central conception of the office, in which all the forms agree, may be indicated by these points:

(1) The bishop receives from God a gift of the Holy Spirit, such as was bestowed on our Lord and on the apostles (or, as is said in later stages, 'bestowed through our Lord on the apostles').

(2) The bishop is chosen for the oversight (*ἐπισκοπή*) and feeding of the flock. In the spirit of the high-priesthood, and in a continuous ministry of worship, he is to propitiate God, and to offer the gifts of the Church.

(3) He is to absolve, and administer discipline with the apostolic authority[2].

(4) He is to 'give forth lots,' that is, to ordain under divine guidance to clerical office.

While the earlier part of the prayer is general, including a first petition for the gift of the Holy

[1] For the doxology, see the *Martyrdom of Polycarp* c. 14, and the paper by J. Armitage Robinson in *Expositor* Jan. 1899.

[2] The main passages are these in the Greek as given in the *Constitutions by Hippolytus*. Καὶ νῦν ἐπίχεε τὴν παρὰ σοῦ δύναμιν τοῦ ἡγεμονικοῦ πνεύματος, ὅπερ διὰ τοῦ ἠγαπημένου σου παιδὸς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δεδώρησαι τοῖς ἁγίοις σου ἀποστόλοις...Καρδιογνῶστα πάντων, δὸς ἐπὶ τὸν δοῦλόν σου τοῦτον, ὃν ἐξελέξω εἰς ἐπισκοπήν, [ποιμαίνειν] σου τὴν ἁγίαν [ποίμνην], καὶ ἀρχιερατεύειν σοι ἀμέμπτως, λειτουργοῦντα νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας, ἀδιαλείπτως τε ἱλάσκεσθαι τῷ προσώπῳ σου, καὶ προσφέρειν σοι τὰ δῶρα τῆς ἁγίας σου ἐκκλησίας· καὶ τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἀρχιερατικῷ ἔχειν ἐξουσίαν ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας κατὰ τὴν ἐντολήν σου, διδόναι κλήρους κατὰ τὸ πρόσταγμά σου, λύειν τε πάντα σύνδεσμον, κατὰ τὴν ἐξουσίαν ἣν ἔδωκας τοῖς ἀποστόλοις...: Funk *Didasc. et Const. Ap.* II 79. It should be noted that at the beginning the Latin (like the Ethiopic) has preserved the early form of phrase (spiritus quem dedisti dilecto Filio tuo, Hauler p. 105). This is smoothed down in CH, but not in AC: for there the passage runs thus: αὐτὸς καὶ νῦν μεσιτείᾳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου δι' ἡμῶν ἐπίχεε τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ ἡγεμονικοῦ σου πνεύματος, ὅπερ διακονεῖται τῷ ἠγαπημένῳ σου παιδὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ ὅπερ ἐδωρήσατο γνώμῃ σου τοῖς ἁγίοις ἀποστόλοις σου (VIII v 5). The phrase also survives in the form of this prayer which is given in the *Testament*.

The two words added in brackets seem to have fallen out from the text here, merely by mistake: they are in the versions, and in *Ap. Const.*

Spirit, the latter part is special. Explicit mention is made of 'episcopal' and high-priestly functions, and others just cited, which would be unsuitable at the ordination of a presbyter. The omission prescribed in the *Canons of Hippolytus* would manifestly, of itself, be insufficient to make the prayer suitable.

The language throughout is markedly biblical. The exordium begins with three texts (II Cor. i 3: Ps. cxii 5 : and Susan. 42) and a phrase which recalls a fourth (Exod. ix 5). It then rehearses the leaders of the Old Covenant, the Patriarchs and the Judges, thus leading up to the Priests and the Sanctuary. Then follows the first petition, which asks for the outpouring of the Spirit, with a reference to Ps. l (li) 12, according to two precedents of the New Testament, namely the Baptism of our Lord, and His gift to the apostles of the same Spirit. The second petition follows, which specially concerns the candidate. It begins with a reference to the appointment of Matthias (Acts i 24) and passes on to the charge of St Paul at Miletus (Acts xx 28). Then comes the most episcopal passage, which rests for the most part on the phraseology of the Levitical priesthood as adopted and interpreted in the Epistle to the Hebrews : and, for the power of absolution, depends on the already mentioned gift of our Lord to the apostles (Jo. xx 23).

The variations in the *Apostolic Constitutions*, representing the third stage, and in the *Testament*, representing the fourth stage, are little else than wordy expansions : and they do not need further notice. But the alterations found in the second stage, in the *Canons of Hippolytus*, are worthy of observation. The episcopal section in the second petition is considerably curtailed and a slight turn is given to a phrase in order to secure more dogmatic propriety : the name of the candidate is introduced ; subsequently an enlargement takes place, introducing a new element into the prayer, namely a

petition that the new bishop may set an uplifting example to his people. A little lower down the powers of absolution are less lengthily, though no less explicitly, mentioned; and it is asked that he may have as well the powers of an Exorcist and a Healer. These innovations are interesting. They introduce new features and seem to shew that there were those who felt the old prayer to be lacking, especially in not sufficiently emphasizing the moral character of the person and the miraculous effects of his work[1].

In the earliest authorities the episcopal consecration takes place in the liturgy, immediately before the offertory. As soon as the consecratory prayer is over, the new bishop receives the kiss of peace, and is hailed with an acclamation. He then makes the oblation, and proceeds with the great Eucharistic prayer, or *anaphora*[2]. The sources in all their four stages give some account of the liturgy here, in fact all the documents, except the *Constitutions by Hippolytus*, do so: but they vary in length and fulness. The variation seems to indicate, what would otherwise be probable, namely, that the original tractate did not include any description or part of the liturgy—unless it were merely some cues, sufficient to indicate the method of fitting in the ordination rite to it. We need not therefore concern ourselves with the accounts of the liturgy. They were very naturally inserted by the compiler in the First Church Order, and are in themselves, no doubt, of immense importance and interest: but they do not bear upon our present subject.

[1] It is interesting to compare this with a passage from Clement of Alexandria: Οὗτος πρεσβύτερός ἐστι τῷ ὄντι τῆς Ἐκκλησίας, καὶ διάκονος ἀληθὴς τοῦ Θεοῦ βουλήσεως, ἐὰν ποιῇ καὶ διδάσκῃ τὰ τοῦ Κυρίου, οὐχ ὑπ' ἀνθρώπων χειροτονούμενος, οὐδ', ὅτι πρεσβύτερος, δίκαιος νομιζόμενος, ἀλλ', ὅτι δίκαιος, ἐν πρεσβυτερίῳ καταλεγόμενος. *Strom.* VI xiii 106.

[2] The Latin version gives the directions thus (Hauler p. 106): Quicumque factus fuerit episcopus, omnes os offerant pacis, salutantes eum, quia dignus effectus est.

Illi vero offerant diacones oblationem: quique inponens manus in eam, cum omni praesbyterio, dicat, gratias agens, 'Dominus vobiscum'....

It must however be noticed that in the third stage the position of the ordination rite relatively to the liturgy is altered. It is introduced into the liturgy at an earlier point in the service than was previously the case, i.e. before the Lessons. This change involves the making of some further changes also. The kiss of peace following the consecratory prayer is retained: but in its new position it is given a new meaning, and becomes a special episcopal greeting: and there is associated with it a ceremony of enthronement. Some other less important alterations, which also are necessitated by the other changes, need only concern us in so far as they suggest the possibility that thenceforward it was not the new bishop who celebrated the ensuing liturgy; but that probably, as was later the custom, the chief consecrator did so.

V

There is no clause dealing with the election of a presbyter, as there is in the case of bishop and deacon: but possibly some traces of such a clause survive[1].

The First Church Order directs the Bishop to pray over a presbyter in the form already given to be used over a bishop. But it also gives a special form of prayer. This we have so far treated as a later interpolation, being influenced by the fact that the compiler of the *Canons of Hippolytus* gives the direction, and not the prayer: and we have so far assumed that the *Canons* in this point represent the original. But it is conceivable that the opposite is the case: that the compiler had before him both direction and prayer; and that, perhaps considering the two things to be inconsistent, he suppressed the prayer and only retained the direction. In that case we have hitherto been misled: the First

[1] The words 'secundum ea quae praedicta sunt' (p. 274, note 3, above) are redundant there: but in the deacon's section (p. 286, note 1) they refer to election.

Church Order will represent the original; and the compiler of the *Canons* has blundered.

This view is greatly reinforced by an explanation, recently put forward[1], of the passage that seems inconsistent.

The presbyter's prayer opens with the same phrase as the bishop's prayer: it differs in having no exordium. But it corresponds again in certain words, when subsequently the central (and special) part of the prayer is reached. The direction then means, that the opening (and general) part of the bishop's prayer is to serve also as the opening for the presbyter's prayer: but thereafter the two are to diverge, the presbyter's prayer continuing in the form set down. The passage then may be represented thus:

The Bishop shall pray as at an episcopal consecration, O God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, etc. (p. 279)...in praise of thy name; *continuing thus*, Look down upon this thy servant, etc.

This explanation seems very convincing. Therefore we may now throw over the compiler of the *Canons*, as being the originator of a mare's nest, and regard this prayer as belonging to the original treatise[2].

It is found in some document or other of all the four stages except this second stage, though the concise form in the First Church Order is expanded in varying degrees in the documents of the third and fourth stages.

[1] By Mr C. H. Turner in *Journ. Theol. Studies* XVI 542–7 (July 1915).

[2] 'Deus et pater domini nostri Jesu Christi...respice super servum tuum istum, et inpartire spiritum gratiae et consilii, praesbyteris ut adiuvet, et gubernet plebem tuam in corde mundo, sicuti respexisti super populum electionis tuae, et praecepisti Moysi, ut elegeret praesbyteros, quos replesti de spiritu tuo quod tu donasti famulo tuo.' CO[1] continues 'Et nunc, domine, praesta indeficienter conservari in nobis spiritum gratiae tuae; et dignos effice ut credentes tibi ministremus, in simplicitate cordis laudantes te' (Hauler p. 109); whereas CO[2] has ὅπως ἐμπλησθεὶς ἐνεργημάτων ἰαματικῶν καὶ λόγων διδακτικῶν ἐν πραύτητι παιδεύῃ σου τοῦτον (τὸν λαὸν *Ap. Const.*) εἰλικρινῶς ἐν καθαρᾷ διανοίᾳ καὶ ψυχῇ θελούσῃ, καὶ τὰς ὑπὲρ τοῦ λαοῦ σου ἱερουργίας ἀμώμως ἐκτελῇ κτλ. (*CPH.* Funk II 80).

It is as markedly presbyteral, as the other (in its central portion) is markedly episcopal. The precedent which is now cited from the Old Testament, is not, as for a bishop, that of the priests who ministered, propitiated, and sacrificed, but that of the seventy elders: and the work of the presbyters is now to cooperate with the bishop in government, as their prototypes did with Moses (Numb. xi 16 and ff.).

At this point in the prayer the later authorities diverge. The older form continued with a petition by the bishop for himself, and perhaps for others assisting and present, in the first person plural. This sudden change seems to have been subsequently thought to be unsuitable. So from this point onward in the prayer, as also in some interpolations at earlier points in it, the later forms introduce new ideas. The presbyter is an official whose duty it is to edify the people by his labour: he has been chosen to enter the presbytery by the vote of the clergy: his ministry will be distinguished by healing activities as well as by teaching: and finally (in the sacerdotal language of later days) he is blamelessly to accomplish the priestly offices (ἱερουργίας) on behalf of the laity.

This prayer too is biblical in character: besides the reference to the seventy elders, there are allusions also to Zech. xii 10 and I Cor. xii 28 in the earlier part, while the later part borrows a phrase from Eph. vi 5 and Col. iii 22.

VI

The section which concerns the deacon is, in its existing forms, more full of theory as to the ministry than any other section. It is however unlikely that this was the case in the original tractate. That presumably contained no more than some brief directions, analogous to those in the preceding sections: and

probably, though not certainly, an ordination prayer. The later forms of the section vary much from one another and are evidently in some state of disorder.

The deacon, like the bishop, is to be elected. The bishop alone gives him the imposition of hands. In these two points the original directions probably consisted[1]. Possibly one other clause, which is common to the two earliest stages of our sources, also formed part of the original: namely an explanation, that the reason why the bishop alone lays on hands is that the deacon is not ordained to priesthood but to ministry. This definition soon became classical. It is very interesting to observe that it apparently formed part of the original tract 'Concerning Ordinations[2].' Even if it did not, it soon was imported into it. The editor of the First Church Order, when he utilized the treatise for his own compilation, was apparently writing at a time of considerable controversy as to the nature and limits of the deacon's office. By the middle of the third century and probably earlier than that, deacons had become very ambitious and presumptuous[3]. Early in the fourth century their usurpation of functions belonging to the presbyterate had to be restrained by conciliar action: and even later still in the century this difficulty was not yet surmounted. Now the compiler of the First Church

[1] The Latin version of the First Church Order begins thus: Diaconus vero, cum ordinatur, eligatur secundum ea quae praedicta sunt similiter: inponens manus episcopus solus, sicuti et praecepimus. (Hauler p. 109. Continued in the note following.)

[2] In diacono ordinando solus episcopus inponat manus, propterea quia non in sacerdotio ordinatur sed in ministerio episcopi.

This phrase in our earliest sources is reproduced almost exactly in canon 4 of the set of Gallican canons of the fifth century, commonly called the *Statuta Ecclesiae Antiqua*. Diaconus cum ordinatur, solus episcopus qui eum benedicit manum super caput illius ponat: quia non ad sacerdotium, sed ad ministerium, consecratur (Bruns *Canones* i 141). Thence the phrase passed into the Gallican Ordination services, and from them it was adopted into the general Latin Rite of the West, formed by a fusion of the Gallican and Roman services.

[3] For an instance see Cyprian *Ep.* III.

Order seems to have been face to face with this problem in some form. Hence his insistence on the subordinate character of the deacon's office. He argues that not only is priesthood not his business : equally teaching is not : he has not received the 'great Spirit' which the presbyters have, therefore he cannot be fellow-councillor with them : he is the subordinate agent of the bishop, and no more.

The compiler also takes the opportunity of limiting by clear definition the capacity of the presbyters. He adds at the end of the section a warning that they have no power to ordain, no, not even to the readership or the subdiaconate. They have power to receive, but they have not power to give what they have received.

All this is taken up and carried on in the third stage. The compiler of that date had a literary, rather than a practical, object : and he inclined always to taking what he found before him, whether it was appropriate to his day or whether it was not, provided that there was (from his point of view) no harm in it.

But in the second stage the policy was different. The compiler of the Hippolytean Canons is practical, and the differences which we observe between his Canons and the documents which form the First Church Order are here both individual and interesting. He does not seem to be specially eager to put deacons in their place. Perhaps the question was not urgent in his surroundings : or perhaps he was a deacon himself. But he is anxious that they should be efficient almoners, as well as efficient ministers in the sanctuary : and he devotes his pen to this end.

His remark that the ordination is to be performed according to the various canons, is rather cryptic, and has a late ring. It corresponds in position with the directions given in the earlier sources for the deacon's election. Originally, we may suppose, this was a popular election, as in the case of the bishop : but in some of the authorities of the first stage the election of the deacon has been

altered into an appointment by the bishop. Possibly this divergence may be the reason for the cautious remark which is introduced by the compiler of the *Canons of Hippolytus*.

Three distinct prayers are recorded for this ordination. There is one in each of the first three stages; while the *Testament* in the fourth stage agrees with the first. This diversity may suggest that there was no prayer prescribed in the original treatise: or else that at the second and third stages people were not pleased with what was there. The prayer found in the first stage is, in style and contents, more similar to the bishop's prayer than either of the other two; it has therefore the best claim of the three to be considered original. There is little that is common to all of them, save the petition for the gift of the Holy Spirit. The first prayer in its exordium compares the deacon's ministry with the ministry of our Lord, and contemplates only his duties in church: it refers to I Tim. iii 13, and prays that he may be advanced to the priesthood. The second on the other hand refers to St Stephen, and desires moral qualities for the ordinand,—that he may have strength to overcome Satan and to set the example of a blameless life. The third prayer, after a long biblical exordium, asks that the new deacon may be a worthy follower of St Stephen, and that by a worthy diaconate he may attain a higher degree. It thus combines two ideas, one of which is found in each of the other prayers.

VII

The atmosphere of the controversies, which have left their mark on the later forms of the chapter about the deacon, is very different from that of the original tracts. These later troubles all lay within the area of the hierarchy: while the earlier ones arose through aggression from outside on the part of those who had

special gifts, which, they thought, entitled them to special consideration. The tract 'Concerning Ordinations' now passes on to consider a set of men, who had such special and personal claims to consideration, inasmuch as they were confessors. It shews how far the Church's consideration will go towards them, and what privilege it is prepared to assign to them on the ground of their confession.

The position which is given to them is a surprising one, considered from the later point of view. The confessor ranks as one of the presbytery in virtue of his confession: he may be reckoned as deacon or presbyter without any laying on of hands. Only if he is to become a bishop, is there to be an ordination service over him.

But this full privilege is only for the confessor who has endured actual sentence or imprisonment. For one who has shewn the same spirit and faithfulness, but has not suffered any penalty of the law, there is a lesser privilege. He is qualified for the ministry: but he will require ordination, either as deacon or as presbyter.

This seems to be the situation as defined in the original tract. But it is difficult to be sure of this, because the authorities are at variance. As time went on, there was evidently a steady decline in the confessor's position. The privilege is found at its highest point in the form stated above. That form is found in two authorities of the first stage, and in the second stage: also it survives, curiously enough, in the last stage[1]. In other authorities we can watch the privilege diminishing. In one the confessor seems to have the

[1] First Church Order (Sahid. and Boh. versions, in G. Horner *Statutes of the Apostles*, 1904, § 34): They shall not lay hand upon him for a ministry or presbyterate. For he has the honour of the presbyterate by his confession. Compare the *Testament* (i 39): A hand is not laid on him for the diaconate: similarly not for the presbyterate. For he hath the honour of the clergy (κλῆρος) (having been protected by the hand of God) by confessorship.

status of a presbyter (or perhaps the qualifications only[1]); but not the office, unless he is ordained. If he is a confessor only in the minor degree, he may be ordained deacon.

In the second stage we find that a new paragraph is introduced dealing with a slave: and the opportunity is taken to introduce a fresh distinction into the theory of ordination. The confessor is held to have received the Spirit of the presbyterate, though not the form. He is to receive ordination: but the bishop will omit from the prayer the petition for the Holy Spirit. In the third stage the matter is of so much less interest that the whole section concerning the confessor is postponed, until after the deaconess, the subdeacon and the reader have been dealt with. It is then laid down that ordination is required for the confessor, if he is to occupy any of the three great degrees. Indeed one might have thought, from the perfunctory way in which the matter is treated, that it had become one of merely academic interest, were it not for a provision added, that any one who assumes any such dignity on account of his confession, is to be deposed.

This honouring of the confessor is entirely in accord with what is known of the respect shewn to him in the early days. The actual term 'confessor' did not become technical, as distinct from 'martyr,' till the later persecutions of the second century[2]. But, no doubt,

[1] It is difficult to be sure whether this distinction between status and qualifications existed at so early an epoch.

[2] *E.g.* in the Epistle from Vienne and Lyons we read of the young Vettius Epagathus, who volunteered evidence in favour of the arrested Christians and was asked whether he himself was a Christian, τοῦ δὲ λαμπροτάτῃ φωνῇ ὁμολογήσαντος, ἀνελήφθη καὶ αὐτὸς εἰς τὸν κλῆρον τῶν μαρτύρων (Euseb. *H.E.* v i § 10, cp. §§ 26, 48). This was his witness: he was probably martyred later on. But in the same letter we see the distinction begin to arise. The much tortured but surviving Christians in that same persecution refused for themselves the title of μάρτυρες, though πολλάκις μαρτυρήσαντες. They accepted it only for those who had been killed; ἡμεῖς δὲ ὁμόλογοι μέτριοι καὶ ταπεινοί (*ibid.* v 2 § 3). Cp. v 3 § 4. For the term 'confessor' as distinct from 'martyr,' see Ps.-Cyprian *De duplici mart.* 31; but the two terms are used side by side in Apollonius' refutation of Montanism, in Euseb. *H.E.* v 18 § 5.

the position of the Christian hero who survived, whether he was called martyr or confessor, was even before that a very honourable one. There do not seem to be other passages available in confirmation of the highest form of privilege such as is accorded to confessors by the tract in its earliest stage. The passage stands alone. But we recall here that Tertullian says of the famous Gnostic Valentine that he left the Church because he was disappointed of a bishopric, to which a rival was elected as being a confessor[1]. This incident illustrates the spirit which prevailed in the minds of electors, and shews the strong appeal that confessorship made in the days of prevailing persecution.

When we come to the next stage, in which confessorship is considered as a qualification for ordination by the bishop, some confirmatory evidence is available. St Cyprian's dealing with the Decian confessors is of this sort. He judged the confessors Aurelius and Celerinus to have qualified for the rank of presbyter. In fact however he ordained them to be readers. He gave in each case a somewhat elaborate reason for choosing that particular rank for them to begin with; and further justified his restricting them to that lower office by pointing to their youth. This action was, no doubt, part of a new policy of curtailing the privileges hitherto enjoyed by confessors. In other respects than actual ordination these two confessors had the old privilege: so far as emoluments were concerned they were to share with the presbyters; and the prospect was held out to them of sitting with the rest in the presbytery later on[2].

The curtailment of the old privileges is also visible in other matters than that of ordination. This was

[1] *Adv. Valent.* 4.

[2] See the letters testimonial from the bishop to the clergy and people. *Epp.* XXXVIII and XXXIX. The case of Saturus and Optatus (*Ep.* XXIX) seems different. Though Optatus was a confessor, it was not apparently on the strength of his confession that he was made subdeacon.

natural. The Decian persecution left a number of confessors probably unparalleled in the earlier days: probably also they themselves were, on the average, of less spiritual calibre than formerly. Then the whole rationale of the situation was altered. The public reputation of a confessor became less: the value of his recommendation of lapsed persons became also less: the privileges were bound to become less also, until, with the cessation of persecution, they ceased altogether.

After observing this gradual decay, we can now work back from the Decian position to the earlier one, and not be astonished if once upon a time the confessor, as such, had been enrolled in the presbytery. If the confessor could secure, on the strength of the witness of the Spirit within him as evidenced by his confession, that his recommendation should gain readmission for the apostate to penitence or to communion, he was doing more than a mere member of the hierarchy could do. Naturally therefore the question would arise, 'Why then should he not be included among the clergy?' And although such an argument as this is inadmissible, because, strictly speaking, it involves a confusion of thought, yet it is the sort of argument which is popular and powerful. Perhaps the line of its developement may be traced in a passage of Origen[1], where he speaks of the powers of binding and loosing as being dependent on the gift of the Spirit. The apostles, he says, had it from our Lord; and others, who shew by their life that they are led by the Spirit, can still bind and loose: for, like the prophets, they are not speaking from themselves, but from God.

This honourable treatment of the confessor makes all the more significant the non-existence of any similar position within the hierarchy for the men who had, or claimed to have, other exceptional gifts of the Spirit. The confessor is included: the prophet and the teacher

[1] *De oratione* 28.

are not. There is then, it would seem, no tradition in their favour, as there is in the case of the confessor. The claim that Montanism puts forward on their behalf is a novel one, and therefore not to be recognized. Such at any rate seems to be the position taken up by the writer of the original tract: and there are no signs of any subsequent departure from the position.

If Montanism had been, as was said then, and as has been said since, not an innovation, but a survival of primitive Christianity, the Church would have had a tradition in favour of the inclusion within the hierarchy of the gifted, such as it had with regard to the confessors, only one that was still more ancient and well-established. But our earliest ordination services shew no sign of this ever having been the case. It is not that prophecy has died out. It has gone on all the time, and has had a continuous recognition by the Church: but it has won no place in the hierarchy,—that is, on its own merits apart from ordination. No doubt the prophetic gifts were in some cases found in an ordained person, while in other cases they may have been found in those who were not ordained. But in either alternative there is no need for any mention of prophecy in a tractate concerning ordinations. Our author has dealt with it in its proper sphere, that is, in connexion with *charismata*; and he does not include it in this sphere.

This view of the situation becomes all the more clear when we think of the prophetess. The Church has no objection to the prophetess: but it will not hear of admitting women to the higher offices of the ministry. The widow and the virgin get recognition subsequently in the new secondary category that is growing up: later on and locally the deaconess will have a position made for her; she will acquire the position that the widow previously had, at the head of the secondary group, and she will take her name from the deacon. But she never becomes, even where she exists (and she is rare),

the counterpart of the deacon, except to a very limited extent. The prophetess, like the prophet, has a gift, but not an office.

While there is no sign that the prophets have, or ever have had, as prophets, a position of privilege among the clergy, on the other hand these ordination services do give evidence of the survival of a privilege, which (if the *Didache* is to be trusted[1]) had once belonged to the prophet, viz. liturgical freedom of speech. Originally this must have belonged to all who led in prayer: but the more solemn forms of prayer, such as the Eucharistic prayer or *anaphora*, tended to become stereotyped and obligatory. Still, however, for a time the old freedom in celebrating was preserved in favour of those who had prophetic gifts. Such at least seems to be the state of things to which the *Didache* bears witness. And just as in the *Didache* it is provided that the prophet may leave the prescribed form of thanksgiving, and take his own line, so here the original tract seems to have reserved to the bishop, if he had the gift, and provided that he was orthodox, the right to use forms of his own.

The phrase used suggests that it is the Eucharistic prayer that is referred to: but it is doubtful whether the tract in its original form dealt at all with the *anaphora*, and therefore this passage is possibly a later addition. But the reference may be general, and the passage original. In that case we should see the author preserving carefully an old-fashioned privilege, which at one epoch had been reserved in favour of those endowed with the prophetic gift. If that be so, we also note that this was a wise course for him to take in face of Montanism, because in so doing he could strengthen the line of argument which he seems to be adopting, viz. that the Church had its own tradition about prophetic gifts, but that this new prophecy was quite alien, and false. In either case for our present purpose the

[1] *Didache* x: τοῖς δὲ προφήταις ἐπιτρέπετε εὐχαριστεῖν ὅσα θέλουσιν.

passage, dealing as it does with the case of the bishop, is significant; because it suggests that this liturgical freedom was held to belong to the ordained man in so far as he was a prophet[1], and not to the prophet in virtue of his gift and without his being an ordained man.

This privilege, like the privilege of the confessor, was soon to vanish. We note the disappearance of this whole passage from our sources after the first stage: and even in the documents of the first stage the privilege is being withdrawn. Apparently the Sahidic version of the First Church Order is the only one that retains the original form unaltered[2]. Other versions have altered the passage so as to withdraw the privilege. This insertion of the negative made such nonsense of the passage, that it is no wonder that it disappeared, and is not found in the later stages.

VIII

The treatise goes on to deal with those classes of people who had no definite ordination by the laying on of hands, but had an official appointment or recognition. There are found in this category the Widow, the Reader, the Subdeacon, and the Virgin. The first three all have an official appointment. There is none in the case of the virgin: only some official recognition is superadded to her own interior call and purpose.

There is added also a very brief section about the Healer, whose position is in some ways analogous to

[1] Such a one was Polycarp, *διδάσκαλος ἀποστολικὸς καὶ προφητικὸς γενόμενος, ἐπίσκοπος τῆς ἐν Σμύρνῃ καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας. Martyrium Polycarpi* 16.

[2] 'It is not altogether necessary for him to recite the same words which we said before (as if learning to say them by heart) in his thanksgiving to God; but according to the ability of each one he is to pray.' Horner p. 309.

that of the virgin. There is no laying on of hands needed for the recognition of his gift. The facts will shew whether he has the gift claimed or not. Presumably, like the recognized virgin, the successful healer will have an ecclesiastical status. Nothing of the sort is said about the prophet, for the prophet, as such, does not come into consideration in this secondary group within the hierarchy, any more than in the primary group. The significance of this can hardly be doubtful. The healer is recognized as a healer, because probably his healing is his only way or claim to recognition. If nothing is said about a similar recognition of the prophet's gift, it is probably because it is presumed that his natural way to acquiring ecclesiastical status is through ordination to some grade of the ministry.

The position given to the Reader has an interest of its own. In the original treatise the widow and the reader stand at the head of the list of those who have appointment. Both of them were soon to descend from that position ; and our documents in the later stages shew their descent. The widow, who was the leading person among the women, gave place to the men, first to the reader, and then to others as they arose in the minor degrees of the clergy. The subdeacon also rose above the reader, as he usurped his functions : and eventually he trod close on the heels of the deacon. Our tract is anterior to such changes, as its method of dealing with these four grades clearly indicates : and we are thus confirmed in the view that it belongs to the era of the Montanist controversy. But the later documents of the series exhibit these changes in some degree ; and, among other things, they also shew the introduction of the deaconess, and the developement of the healer into the exorcist,—two features which are not found in the first, second, or fourth stage, but appear in the documents of the third.

IX

The study of the two tracts has carried us a long distance, from the early part of the third century on to the end of the fourth, and even, so far as the partly novel and partly archaic *Testament* is concerned, probably into the fifth. If we seek for other ante-Nicene evidence as to actual Ordination services we shall, unfortunately, be disappointed. We must travel beyond the date of Nicaea if we are to trace out further liturgical evidence. It will be well to do so, at least so far as to include some view of the ordination prayers in the Sacramentary of Sarapion. This document is earlier in date than the materials of the third stage studied above: and therefore there is good reason for rounding off with it our enquiry into the liturgical evidence. It is also germane to our subject, because the existence of a collection of prayers attributed to Sarapion shews that the liturgical freedom of the individual bishop in the *anaphora* and other solemn prayers was, in some form at any rate, preserved down to the middle of the fourth century.

The lesser orders which are contemplated in Sarapion's book are subdeacons, readers and interpreters. Those who are admitted to these grades have no laying on of hands, and no ordination prayers are provided for them.. Their existence however is recognized. Since the book is simply a collection of prayers without rubrics or directions, it is not possible to ascertain any details of ceremonial that may have accompanied their appointment, nor even the point in the liturgy at which these ordinations took place. When we pass on to consider the major orders, there are simply three consecratory prayers available for study. Whether or no they were written by Sarapion himself, it is not possible to say. In any case, they are somewhat angular and bald, especially those for the presbyter and the bishop.

The exordium of the prayer said over the bishop

refers to the sending of our Lord into the world, the choice of the apostles, and the past generations of bishops: then follow petitions that the new bishop may be a worthy bishop, a holy successor of the apostles, filled, as in the old days, with grace and the Holy Spirit: so that he may feed the flock blamelessly in a laudable episcopate[1].

The prayer for the ordination of presbyters begins in the first person plural with the bald statement 'we have laid our hand upon this man,' which perhaps implies that the presbyters have joined in the imposition of hands. The special purposes for which the gift of the Holy Spirit is asked, are stewardship, the ministry of the oracles, and the reconciliation of the people. Reference is then made to the seventy elders, and a fresh petition follows for the gifts of wisdom, knowledge, and faith (as in I Cor. xii 8, 9).

The prayer for the ordination of the deacon has a long and shapely exordium, referring to the incarnation, the government and the threefold ministry of the Church, with a special mention of the Seven. The petitions are very general:—that the ordinand may be a deacon of the Catholic Church, filled with the spirit of wisdom and discretion, and so capable of worthily ministering among the holy people[2].

X

There is little or nothing added here to the ideas which we have already gathered from the other set of sources. On the other hand, if we now turn from the purely liturgical evidence, we may put together some scattered references in the contemporary literature,

[1] See this idea of blamelessness also above, p. 279; and in the consecration of Zacchaeus, *Clem. Recogn.* III 66.

[2] See Mr Brightman's edition of Sarapion in *Journ. Theol. Studies* for 1899, pp. 88—113, 247—277: or Bishop Wordsworth's translation (S.P.C.K. 1899).

in order to fill up some parts of the picture of ordination which the two tracts and Sarapion do not fill.

The starting-point is, in the case of each of the major orders, an election by the people. The tract, it is true, does not mention this in case of the presbyter, as it does in the case of both bishop and deacon ; but this is probably a mere oversight[1]. The minor orders have no such election presupposed: and probably, as these offices grew up, the appointment to them was otherwise made. But we may note that Cyprian characteristically rested upon the general advice of the Church even in the appointment of a reader and a subdeacon[2].

The popular election was not quite what we understand by the term : the people acted as the Spirit-bearing body, on behalf of God, and with a deep sense of responsibility. It was this that made them open to influences which to us may seem strange. The dove alighting on the head of Fabian in 250[3], like the voice which in later days designated Ambrose to be bishop, was recognized as divine guidance for the election. Similarly thirty years earlier the people had sallied forth from the gates of Jerusalem to seek the coadjutor of their aged bishop, Narcissus, confident that, in so doing, they were following a divine guidance : and they met Alexander, a bishop from Cappadocia, and constrained him to remain with them[4].

In the case of the presbyters and deacons, the bishop's wish counted for much in the election. It was through the urgency of the bishop, and against the wish of all the clergy and many of the laity, that Novatian's ordination to the presbyterate was sanctioned[5].

No doubt there were differences and quarrels over elections[6], and no doubt mistakes were made. Episcopal

[1] Origen describes what is the right procedure at the election of a priest, in *Hom. in Levit.* VI 3.

[2] *Ep.* XXIX. [3] Euseb. *H.E.* VI 29 § 3. [4] *ibid.* VI 11 § 2.

[5] *ibid.* VI 43 § 17. [6] Origen *Hom. in Num.* XXII 4.

elections especially caused trouble, not mere immediate divisions, but lasting schisms. It is only necessary to recall such well-known cases in the Roman succession as those of Callistus (218), Cornelius (251) and Eusebius (309). Even heresy too was thought in some cases to be the result of a disappointed candidature, as when it was said of Valentine that he broke with the Church because he was not elected to the bishopric which he thought himself to have deserved[1]. But in spite of drawbacks, ecclesiastical elections had such a good reputation that the Emperor Alexander Severus recommended their procedure as a model to be copied in civil cases[2].

When an election took place, in some instances the neighbouring bishops had already been warned, as we see in the case at Jerusalem already mentioned; in other cases they were not present at the election. In the case of Fabian, it is the 'brethren' who are said to be assembled for the election. Cyprian's rule is 'that for the proper celebration of ordinations all the neighbouring bishops of the same province should assemble, together with the flock...and the bishop should be chosen in the presence of the people': and thereupon ordained[3]. Apparently a name was put forward and probably accepted by the people's acclamation: but in the much troubled election at Cirta in 305, when the name of Silvanus was put forward for bishop, the people shouted, *Alius fiat, exaudi deus*, knowing that Silvanus was a *traditor*, and preferring a local candidate. In spite of this however he procured election and consecration[4].

In contrast also with a proper election we have the history of Novatian's consecration as given by Cornelius. There was no previous election by the people

[1] Tertullian, *Adv. Valent.* 4, cp. Heges. *ap.* Eus. *H.E.* IV 22 § 5.
[2] Aelius Lampridius, *Vita Alexandri*, 45.
[3] *Ep.* LXVII 5, cp. 3, 4, and also *Epp.* LV 8; LVI 1; LXVIII 2.
[4] *Gesta apud Zenophilum* § 10.

or clergy, for he had been already rejected by them, and had sworn to make no further attempt to gain the episcopate. But he got together three rustic bishops from the country to Rome and there 'at the tenth hour when they had become drunk and sick,' he prevailed on them to consecrate him. So wrote Cornelius; and whether his account be accepted as trustworthy or not, it is at any rate a description of the unideal consecration[1].

A considerable literature grew up with regard to the qualifications required for the orders; it was based upon the passages in the Pastoral Epistles. These were developed at great length in the *Didascalia*, and they inspired also the descriptions in the *Apostolic Church Order*. As both of these documents are found in close connexion with the tracts which we have been studying, they deserve to be consulted on this matter of the qualifications: but as to other arrangements the line taken in the *Apostolic Church Order* is somewhat fantastic, and does not add much to our knowledge of practical things.

Later, when conciliar action begins, and makes lasting legislation in the shape of canons, some of these concern the disqualifications. Canons concerning this point were made at the ante-Nicene Council of Elvira[2] (*c.* 300), and the Nicene Council itself passed its 9th canon on the subject.

XI

There are a few passages which may be cited as bearing on the early relation of the bishop to the presbyters. Certainly the presbytery contained different elements with different qualifications. Some early evidence of this is seen even in the Pastoral Epistles, where some

[1] Euseb. *H.E.* VI 43 §§ 8, 9.
[2] Canons 24, 30, 80.

presbyters are distinguished from the others as labouring in the word and doctrine[1]. Even as late as St Cyprian's time we find in Africa some presbyters distinguished from the rest as *presbyteri doctores*[2]. It was easy, in other places, where the presbyteral council had a strong position, to regard the bishop as a specially differentiated presbyter.

In ideal descriptions the presbyters were set down as twelve in number,—as, for example, in the Clementine documents and in the *Testament*[3]. This description is no doubt modelled upon the precedent of the apostles. According to the *Apostolic Church Order* there are to be four and twenty (as in the Apocalypse), half of whom have the care of those who labour at the altar, and half have the care of the people[4]. In this we should perhaps discern a distinction between presbyters who lead the worship and others who manage the business of the church. But such schemes are symbolical rather than historical.

Practically it was the multiplication of urban congregations that altered the presbyter's position, by the entrusting of congregations, and ultimately parishes, to individual members of the presbytery. In Rome the large number of presbyters (46) that existed in the middle of the third century was probably due to the fact of individuals having local responsibilities; just as presumably each of the seven deacons of the city was attached to one of seven ecclesiastical 'regions,' and had under him one subdeacon and six acolytes[5].

[1] I Tim. v 17.

[2] *Ep.* XXIX. An earlier instance of the use of the phrase is found in the Passion of SS. Perpetua and Felicitas § 13, where the Latin has 'presbyterum doctorem,' but the late and unintelligent Greek version has only πρεσβύτερον. (Ed. Robinson pp. 82, 83.)

[3] *Recogn.* III 66, VI 15: *Homil.* XI 36: and *Test.* 34.

[4] Text in Bickell *Gesch. des Kirchenrechts* p. 123, or Harnack *Lehre der zwölf Apostel* p. 233; or Horner pp. 134, 240, 302.

[5] Euseb. *H.E.* VI 43 § 11: 46 presbyters, 7 deacons, 7 subdeacons, 42 acolytes, with 52 exorcists, readers, and door-keepers.

In those parts of the world where country congregations were each ruled by a bishop, there was probably little official activity open to a presbyter: but as the country bishop became first restricted, and then almost suppressed, and wherever a more territorial form of diocese —comprising urban, suburban and rural areas—grouped itself round the bishop of the central city, the local presbyter became the parish priest.

Now all this implies an advance in the presbyter's position, not the reverse. It tells against any theory that originally he had shared the bishop's ordination prayer. It suggests that the *Canons of Hippolytus* in this matter represent not a survival, but an innovation[1] or a blunder. The growth of sacerdotal language observable in the later forms of the presbyteral prayer also corresponds: and the language of the *Canons* is paralleled in St Jerome's exaltation of his own order[2]. In short we have travelled at least a century away from Hippolytus and the original treatise.

Meanwhile the bishop was growing also in greatness, as contrasted with the presbyterate. The developement of the ceremony of the enthronement shews this. We can parallel the growth, as we have seen it in the service, by other evidence. In the early part of the fourth century a throne was being shewn at Jerusalem which was said to be that of St James as the first bishop of Jerusalem[3]. The idea of the single throne was at least a century older, for *cathedra* is used as a technical term by Origen and even by Tertullian[4]. In the consecrations described in the Clementine literature much is made of the throne[5]. Installation goes with

[1] The compiler certainly innovated by toning down the bishop's consecration prayer. See above, p. 281.

[2] See p. 276, note 1. Are the *Canons*, as a whole, of his date, and Alexandrian in origin?

[3] Euseb. *H.E.* VII 19.

[4] Origen, *In Matth.* XVI 22: Tert. *De praescr.* 36.

[5] *Homil.* III 63: cp. *Recogn.* III 66: *Clement to James* 2, 3, 19 and compare *Didasc.* 4, and for Fabian of Rome Eus. *H.E.* VI 29 § 3.

consecration : and elsewhere we see how this conception refers back to the idea of the thrones of the apostles[1], and is ultimately based on Matt. xix 28, Luc. xxii 30, and again Apoc. xx 4.

Further we must take into account the distinguishing title of ἀρχιερεύς, to which the bishop's prayer alludes. It is found similarly in the Preface to the *Philosophumena* of Hippolytus where it refers to the apostles. Elsewhere the word is appropriated to the bishops, as in Tertullian and the *Didascalia*[2], and in documents allied with those which we are now studying[3]. If the word were really used over the presbyter, the use would be, so far as we know, unique. In fine the collateral evidence confirms the impression that the *Canons of Hippolytus* in this respect are misleading, and have enjoyed more credit than they deserve.

XII

The view taken in the tract concerning the lower ranks of the clergy is appropriate to the early part of the third century, and fits in with evidence available from elsewhere. Tertullian, in his more restricted list, mentions besides the three major grades, only the Widow. His fuller list has also the Virgin, the Doctor, and the Martyr, i.e. Confessor : and later in the same work he mentions the Reader[4]. This outlook corresponds very closely with the position which we have noted in our treatise. As yet there is no uniformity. In the third century the line between the clergy and the laity was only beginning to be defined. Naturally it was at first drawn below the Deacon. As payment

[1] Ps.-Cyprian, *De aleatoribus* 1.

[2] Hippol. *Philos.* pref. ὧν (ἀποστόλων) ἡμεῖς διάδοχοι τυγχάνοντες, τῆς τε αὐτῆς χάριτος μετέχοντες, ἀρχιερατείας τε καὶ διδασκαλίας. Tert. *De bapt.* 17 summus sacerdos qui est episcopus : *Didasc.* 9.

[3] See the end of the First Church Order, in Hauler § LXXVII pp. 116, 117 : in Horner p. 180 and the parallel passages : and also see Lagarde *Reliquiae Iuris* p. 89. *Apost. Const.* VIII xlvi 4, 14.

[4] Tert. *De monog.* 11 : *De praescr.* 3, 41.

for clerical work began to be more usual, there followed an increasing withdrawal of the clergy from secular occupations ; and we may see how, in the Councils of the fourth century, beginning with Elvira, such withdrawal more and more became compulsory.

Meanwhile the lower ranks had been forming, had been acquiring status, and were coming to be reckoned in some degree among the clergy. The Reader[1] and the Widow were the first to get a distinct position. The Subdeacon arose through the necessity of diminishing the double burden, liturgical and administrative, that accumulated on the shoulders of the Deacon. The tract 'Concerning Ordinations' is among the first witnesses that this piece of developement has taken place. The office seems to be unknown in the second century : in the middle of the third it is conspicuous and stands next to the diaconate, at any rate in Carthage and Rome. In the East perhaps it is later in appearance than in the West. All this supports the position exhibited in our tract.

It is noticeable also that the tract is silent as regards the Acolyte. The office was well known in Rome and in Carthage in the time of Cornelius and Cyprian[2] : but it is not attested earlier, and is unknown in the East till Justinian's time[3]. An early view of the Exorcist is also characteristic of our documents. Those which belong to the two earlier stages contain no reference to any office of exorcist. But at the third stage we find the Healer of the two earlier stages transformed into the Exorcist. Now the earliest mentions of such an office extant are in letters to Cyprian[4] and in the list of the Roman clergy given by Cornelius. So again we are

[1] With the Reader may be put the Catechist, who seems to take the Reader's place in the pseudo-Clementine literature.

[2] For Cornelius' list of Roman clergy see above p. 302 n. 5. For Cyprian see *Epp.* XXXIV 4 ; LII 1 ; LXXVII 3 ; LXXVIII 1.

[3] *Novell.* 59.

[4] *Apud* Cypr. *Epp.* XXIII, LXXV 10.

confirmed in thinking that our earliest sources belong to the first part of the third century.

While the grades of the clergy were becoming defined, there arose also the conception of these grades as a series of stages to be taken successively. This idea was borrowed from the secular series of public offices, or at any rate much influenced by it. But no legislation or fixed custom regulating the matter is known until the middle of the fourth century, when the tenth of the canons attributed to the Council of Sardica required that a bishop-elect should first pass through the degrees of reader, deacon and presbyter. A century earlier it was especially mentioned of Cornelius, probably because the case was exceptional, that he had been promoted through all the ecclesiastical offices[1]. Cyprian, his contemporary, had also been a priest: but he had not been a deacon. In many instances the new bishop passed straight from the diaconate to the throne. Even in Alexandria, where the election was kept close in the hands of the presbyterate, and it was usual to appoint a presbyter, we have a great instance to the contrary in the appointment of Athanasius, a deacon, by the popular choice. It was even possible for the candidate to be one from among the minor clergy. At the disputed election in Cirta, Silvanus was only a subdeacon; and neither at the time, nor subsequently, was this put forward as an objection against him[2]. We cannot be certain that he was consecrated direct to the episcopate without passing through the intermediate degrees, or any of them: but presumably this was so.

The germ of the whole idea lies in the passage I Tim. iii 13, where the deacon has the prospect of a 'good degree' held out to him. This passage made its way into two of the three prayers provided, in the

[1] Cypr. *Ep.* LV 8, and compare the case of Philip, bishop of Heraclea; *Passio* § 1, in Ruinart *Acta MM. Sincera.*

[2] *Gesta apud Zenophilum* § 10.

group of services which we have had before us, for the ordination of the deacon: and of this the conception of a clerical 'ladder' was a natural, though gradual, outcome.

XIII

Finally we may put to ourselves the difficult question, What is the conception of ordination that lies behind these services? The most prominent feature in the two treatises is the strong assertion of the apostolic tradition, and of the episcopate as the sole authority that is empowered to continue the tradition. This does not however necessarily mean that the imposition of hands is itself the exclusive channel of the spiritual grace. The view of the *charismata* which is taken all through, is that God gives as He pleases: and the corporate consciousness of the Church recognizes those gifts wherever it sees them. It recognizes the initial grace by which a man turns from heathenism: indeed it is that which leads the Church to give him the grace of baptism and the status of a Christian. It recognizes in others the antecedent grace of vocation to the ministry: the evidence for this may come in various ways; partly, it may be, through some external witness to God's choice[1], partly no doubt, by the man's own sense of call, but far more explicitly, so far as our authorities are concerned, by the call and election of the Church[2]: and then it gives him the consequent

[1] Such witness is prominent in the New Testament, taking the form, for example, of the divine lots in Acts i 24—26, of the prophecies pronounced over Timothy, mentioned in I Tim. i 18, or of the Separation of Barnabas and Saul for missionary work by a mandate of the Holy Spirit in Acts xiii 2. Later instances of such external witness have been cited above in the cases of Fabian at Rome, Alexander at Jerusalem and Ambrose at Milan.

[2] Presuppositions such as these lie behind the language of the consecration prayer on p. 279. In maintaining such a view of the choice of God the Christian Church was but carrying on the tradition of the Old

grace of orders, and his position in the ministry, praying for the descent of the Holy Spirit upon him, as the elect of God, in order that he may have the needful fulness of spiritual gift.

Possibly we ought to infer that this gift was regarded as antecedent to, and, in a sense, independent of, the open and formal petition for it: for in our earliest form of the service for the consecration of a bishop the most solemn moment seems to have been that of the silent petition, accompanied by the laying on of hands by all the bishops, rather than the subsequent moment, when the prayer was recited, accompanied by the imposition of the hands of the single representative of the episcopate.

No particular form of words is needed: nor from the various prayers provided can it be deduced that any special requirements are made as to the contents of a consecratory prayer. It is assumed no doubt, though not expressly stated, that it will include the petition for the Holy Spirit. On the other hand it is stipulated that the bishop who says the prayer must be sound and right. This stipulation agrees with similar requirements made in other documents, and recognized as essential to a catholic ordination. There is no attempt made to say what is the value of an ordination in which this requirement is not fulfilled—through heresy, or through schism. The tract 'Concerning Spiritual Gifts' is very emphatic as to bishops who were not real, but only falsely called bishops[1]. The phrase indeed is not at all an unsuitable one to expect from Hippolytus,—if indeed he was the writer. But it is vague and polemical rather than theological or legal. And, in fact, it was

Covenant, as Origen insisted in his exposition of Num. xxvii 16—18 (*Hom. in Num.* xxii 4).

[1] *οὔτε ἐπίσκοπος ἀγνοίᾳ ἢ κακονοίᾳ πεπιεσμένος ἔτι ἐπίσκοπός ἐστιν, ἀλλὰ ψευδώνυμος, οὐ παρὰ θεοῦ, ἀλλὰ παρὰ ἀνθρώπων προβληθείς. Apost. Const.* viii ii 4.

only slowly, and at the cost of many disputed ordinations, that the Church acquired some beginnings of a theory upon the subject, in the course of the third century.

The Church thus disallows some ordinations. On the other hand, it is, in the earliest stage, prepared to recognize confessorship, without ordination, as giving a position among the clergy. The ground of this is explicitly stated to be, that the confession has revealed a special gift of the Spirit. But, as confessorship increases in quantity and loses in quality, with a growing decline in the whole-heartedness of the persecutor, this privilege is withdrawn. The theory is not changed, perhaps, but the Church recognizes the altered state of circumstances, when confessorship no longer means necessarily exceptional heroism or supereminent spiritual endowment.

Other signs of the Church's recognition of spiritual gift occur in the case of the Virgin, and in some degree of the Healer. In the former case the Church recognizes the vocation and there the matter ends. The Virgin is recognized, without any ceremony, and that is all. But the Healer is eligible for the clergy : and his gift, when verified, will be recognized by the Church as a qualification.

These cases shew that the apostolic tradition is not regarded in any rigid way. It is no mere mechanical succession that is maintained, without any regard paid to exceptional or uncovenanted workings of the Holy Spirit of God. On the contrary, the Church is regarded as responsible for making the most of all these, as well as for finding room for them in the orderly method of its polity, and consecrating them, where necessary, by its rites. But those who claim to be gifted and will not submit themselves to the Church's arbitrament, are necessarily disqualified.

If we attempt to summarize the position now reached, four points seem to stand out in special prominence.

First it is to be noticed that all gifts of grace are given by God, including the ordinary gifts given to the believer, and the more special gifts which are given for the ministry or for the exercise of exceptional powers. Secondly the Church takes action with regard to these gifts. In some cases it confines itself to giving a formal recognition to them, as in the case of Virgin or Healer: in others it follows up its recognition by an act of appointment to office, as in the case of Subdeacon or Reader: in others it makes a more formal recognition of the divine gift by an act of election, and then proceeds by the solemn act of ordination to invest the man, whom God has called, with the special graces of the ministry and with authority to act as a representative of the Body of Christ. Thirdly it is to be observed that the local Church is bound to take such action with the main stream of the apostolic tradition behind it, in order to have full approbation and acceptance. Action which is taken apart from that, cannot be accepted as action of the apostolic Church. Fourthly, this action must also be taken in union, not only with the continuous historic Body, but also with the contemporaneous Body, with the Catholic Church of the day, as represented by the bishops of the province or neighbourhood.

These four points emerge into clearness even out of such scanty material as we have had to handle,—liturgical or historical and patristic. We do not by any means arrive at a full theory and practice of ordination: but we are led to see the essentials, as they were understood in the third and fourth centuries.

A COMPARATIVE TABLE OF THE SOURCES

(For list of authorities see next page)

	First Church Order (CO¹)					Canons of Hippolytus		Second Church Order (CO²)						Testament of our Lord
	Eth.	Ar.	Sah.	Boh.	Lat.		Const. P. H.	Eth.	Ar.	Sah.	Boh.	A. C.	S. O.	
						1								
A. Concerning	Spiritual Gifts													
§§ 1 and 2	—	—	—	—	—		1, 2	49–52*a*	48–51*a*	63*a*	63	1, 2	iv 1–11	—
Transition	40	—	—	—	LXVII		—	52*c*	51*b*	63*b*	64	3	v 1	—
B. Concerning	Ordinations													
1. Bishops and Eucharist	22*a* 22*b*	21*a* 21*b*	31*a* 31*b*	31*a* 31*b*	LXVIII LXIX–LXXI	2, 3*a* 3*b*	3, 4 —	53*a* 53*b*	52*a* 52*b*	64*a* 64*b*, 65	65*a* 65*b*, 66	4, 5*a* 5*b*–15	v 2–6	i 21 23
2. Presbyters	23	22	32	32	LXXI	4	5, 6	54*a*	53*a*	66*a*	67*a*	16	v 7, 8	30
3. Deacons	24	23	33	33	LXXII	5	7, 8	54*b*	53*b*	66*b*	67*b*	17, 18	v 9, 10	34, 38
					* * *	Deaconess—9, 10		54*c*	53*c*	66*c*	67*c*	19, 20	v 11, 12	—
4. Confessors	25	24	34	34		6	14	55	54	67	68	23	v 17, 18	39
						9*a*								
5. Widows	26	25	37	37		9*b*	16	56*b*	55*b*	69	70	25	v 29	40, 41
6. Readers			35	35		7	13	54*c*	53*c*	66*c*	67*c*	22	v 15, 16	45
Virgins			38	38		7	15	56*a*	55*a*	68	69	24	v 19	46
Subdeacon	27	26	36	36		7	11, 12	54*c*	53*c*	66*c*	67*c*	21	v 13, 14	44
Healer			39	39		8	Exorcist 17	56*c*	55*c*	70	71	26	v 21	47

After this point the parallelism of the different documents ceases to be so marked, and divergence sets in.

The authorities for the comparative table of sources are as follows:

For Ethiopic, Arabic, Sahidic, see Horner, *The Statutes of the Apostles* (London, 1904).

For Bohairic, see Tattam, *Apostolical Constitutions* (London, 1848).

For Latin fragments, see Hauler, *Didascaliae Apostolorum Fragmenta* (Leipzig, 1900).

For Canons of Hippolytus, see Achelis, *Die ältesten Quellen des orientalischen Kirchenrechts*, in *Texte und Untersuchungen* VI (Leipzig, 1891): or Riedel, *Die Kirchenrechtsquellen des Patriarchats Alexandrien* (Leipzig, 1900).

For Constitutiones per Hippolytum, see Lagarde, *Reliquiae juris Eccl. antiq.* (Leipzig, 1856), or Funk (as below) under the title "Epitome" ii 72—96.

For Apostolic Constitutions, see Funk, *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum* (2 vols. Paderborn, 1906), or Cabrol and Leclercq, *Monumenta Ecclesiae Liturgica*, vol. I Sect. 2 (Paris, 1913). Each of these contains also others of the above documents.

For The Testament, see Rahmani, *Testamentum D. N. Jesu Christi* (Mainz, 1899); Cooper and Maclean, *The Testament of our Lord* (Edinburgh, 1902); it forms the first two books of the Syrian Octateuch.

For The Syrian Octateuch (SO) see F. Nau, *La version syriaque de l'Octateuque de Clément*, traduit en Français (Paris, 1913). The first two books contain The Testament: the third contains the Apostolic Church Order: the next four books are the equivalent of the eighth book of the Apostolic Constitutions, but no account of the Liturgy (A. C. VIII 10—15) is included, and certain other topics (A. C. VIII 35—41) are also wanting here, having already been, for the most part, handled in The Testament. The last book contains The Canons of the Apostles.

A considerable part of the earlier authorities is printed in *Journal of Theol. Studies*, April 1915 (vol. XVI, No. 63, pp. 323—371).

*** This Essay had been for a long time in print before the appearance of Dom Connolly's minute investigation of certain points connected with these documents in his volume, *The so-called Egyptian Church Order, and derived documents* (Texts and Studies, vol. VIII, No. 4, Cambridge, 1916). He declares definitely for Hippolytus' authorship of the First Church Order. So far as the purpose of the present Essay is concerned, there is not much difference between us.

ESSAY VI

TERMS OF COMMUNION AND THE MINISTRATION OF THE SACRAMENTS IN EARLY TIMES

F. E. BRIGHTMAN, M.A.

SUMMARY

A. TERMS OF COMMUNION.

PAGE

Introduction: the New Testament basis 316

I. Conditions of Initiation into the Communion of the Church.

i. Admission to the Catechumenate 320
ii. The Catechesis 330
iii. Lent and the Catechumenate 340
iv. Baptism and Confirmation 342
v. Infant Baptism 352

II. Conditions of Continuance in the Communion of the Church.

i. The Disciplinary System 355
ii. The Sins which incurred Suspension from Communion 357
iii. The Application of the Discipline 363

III. Conditions of Restoration to the Communion of the Church.

i. The Status of the Penitent 366
ii. The Character and Duration of Penance . . 368
iii. The Process of Reconciliation 371
iv. Cases in which Reconciliation was refused . . 373

IV. Conclusion 377

B. THE MINISTRATION OF THE SACRAMENTS.

I. The normal functions of the several Orders.

1. The Bishop 381
2. The Presbyters 385
3. The Deacons 387
4. The Minor Orders 388

II. The Minister of the Sacraments.

1. Baptism 390
2. Confirmation 393
3. The Eucharist 394
4. Absolution 397
5. Ordination 400
6. Marriage 403
7. Unction of the Sick 405

III. Conclusion 406

VI

TERMS OF COMMUNION AND THE MINISTRATION OF THE SACRAMENTS IN EARLY TIMES

A. TERMS OF COMMUNION

Like other societies, the Christian Society has always had its conditions of membership, its 'terms of communion,' corresponding to its presuppositions and its aims. In considering these 'terms,' as they were understood in the ante-Nicene period of the history of the Church, there are obviously three subjects to be handled. First, the terms of *admission* to the fellowship of the Church; and, since Baptism is the door of entrance, we have to enquire what were the conditions on which Baptism was bestowed. Secondly, since what was required of candidates for Baptism was no passing disposition but the permanent attitude of the Christian life, and *continuance* in the Christian fellowship was therefore conditional upon the continued observance of the original terms of admission, and the grave violation of them involved the suspension of membership, in other words, excommunication; we have to consider the conditions under which Excommunication was incurred. And thirdly, since the purpose of excommunication was in part to secure the reformation of the offender and his *restoration* to communion, we have to enquire what were the terms on which the offender might be reconciled, that is, the conditions of Absolution.

In order to set out the facts under these three heads, we may attempt to collect and arrange such information as is available, first, as to the process of Christian Initiation, and then as to the disciplinary system of the Church in so far as it was concerned with the Excommunication and the Reconciliation of offenders.

The principles and the essential elements of the later practice of the Church are to be found in the New Testament.

The individual instances of Baptism alluded to in the New Testament are rather exceptional cases than examples of what may be supposed to have been the normal procedure in churches already in some degree settled. But the circumstances of these cases are sufficient to indicate that the conditions of baptism were summed up in two requirements: Repentance and Faith. The apostolic message was 'repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ.'[1] 'The saving grace of God had appeared to all men, teaching us that, renouncing ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should begin to live soberly, righteously, and godly.'[2] S. Peter's charge, therefore, at the outset is '*Repent* and be baptized.'[3] The first condition is the renunciation of the past; and so far, like the baptism of John, Christian baptism is 'a baptism of repentance for the remission of sins.'[4] But it is 'Repent and be baptized *in the Name of Jesus Christ.*'[5] Baptism therefore presupposes 'confession with the mouth that Jesus is Lord, and belief with the heart that God raised Him from the dead.'[6] This 'word of faith which' the apostles 'preached'[7] could be summarized, as it is here, in 'Jesus is Lord,'[8] or in 'I believe that Jesus Christ is

[1] Acts xx 21 : cp. xxvi 18, Heb. vi 1. [2] Tit. ii 11 sq.
[3] Acts ii 38. [4] S. Luke iii 3, Acts xiii 24. [5] Acts ii 38.
[6] Rom. x 9. [7] Rom. x 8. [8] 1 Cor. xii 3, 2 Cor. iv 5, Phil. ii 11.

the Son of God.'[1] Or if we observe the earliest apostolic preaching and what in the apostolic epistles is assumed to be already known to the readers and can be taken for granted, we can infer that 'the word of faith,' 'the form of doctrine to which' the faithful had been 'delivered'[2] at their baptism, drawn out in detail, implied, with whatever degree of explicitness, the confession of 'one' 'living and true God,' 'the Father, of whom are all things,'[3] 'who made heaven and earth and the sea and all things that are therein'[4]; and of 'one Lord, Jesus Christ, through whom are all things,'[5] 'the Son of God,'[6] 'made man,'[7] 'of the seed of David,'[8] 'who died for our sins according to the Scriptures, and was buried, and was raised the third day according to the Scriptures,'[9] and 'ascended into heaven'[10] and 'is on the right hand of God'[11] and shall come[12] 'to judge the world in righteousness'[13] as 'judge of quick and dead'[14]; and of the Holy Ghost[15]; of 'the Church of God,'[16] the new Israel[17]; of the remission of sins[18]; and of the resurrection of the dead[19] and eternal life[20]. This then was implicit in the simplest confession of the Faith, and with more or less of explicitness must have formed the matter of instruction preparatory to bap-

[1] Acts viii 37 : this does not belong to the first text of the Acts, but see ix 20, 1 Jo. iv 15, v 5, 13.

[2] Rom. vi 17. [3] 1 Cor. viii 6, 1 Thess. i 9.

[4] Acts iv 24, xiv 15, xvii 24. [5] 1 Cor. viii 6.

[6] Acts ix 20, Rom. i 4, Gal. ii 20 : cp. Heb. iv 14, 1 Jo. iv 15.

[7] Gal. iv 4 *γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικός*, not 'born of a woman,' but 'become of-woman' i.e. 'become human.'

[8] Rom. i 3 : cp. Acts ii 30, xiii 23, 2 Tim. ii 8.

[9] 1 Cor. xv 3 sq. : Acts ii 23 sq., 29 sqq., iii 15, 1 Thess. iv 14, Rom. iv 25, v 6, 8, vi 4 sq.

[10] Acts ii 34 sqq. [11] Rom. viii 34 : Acts ii 33, iii 21.

[12] Acts iii 20, 1 Thess. i 10, iv 15 sq., 2 Thess. i 7, 10, ii 1.

[13] Acts xvii 31. [14] Acts x 42 : cp. Heb. vi 2.

[15] Acts xix 2 sqq., ii 33. [16] Acts xx 28 : cp. 1 Cor. xii 12 sqq.

[17] Gal. vi 16, iii 29. [18] Acts x 43, xiii 38, xxvi 18.

[19] Acts iv 2, xxiii 6, 1 Th. iv 16, Rom. vi 5, 1 Cor. xv, 2 Cor. v 1 Heb. vi 2.

[20] Acts xiii 46, 1 Thess. iv 17, Rom. vi 22 sq.

tism; and on the profession of repentance and the confession of this faith men were baptized in the Name of Jesus Christ[1] and, at least by implication, in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost[2]; and by prayer and the imposition of the Apostles' hands received the Gift of the Holy Ghost[3].

By this 'washing of regeneration and of renewal of the Holy Ghost'[4] the subject of baptism was incorporated into the Church of God, the society of those who were called 'in sanctification'[5] to be 'saints,'[6] knit together in 'the fellowship' and 'the unity of the Spirit'[7] and the 'unity of the faith.'[8] His sins had been 'washed away'[9] and he was bound to sin no more: sin, the deliberate defiance of the law of God and of duty to man[10], was no longer morally possible for him[11]. But if he sinned, forgiveness was still open to him, on his own initiative 'if he confessed his sins'[12]; otherwise, and if the offence was open and notorious, the Church, in order to guard its own integrity, lest the 'little leaven' should 'leaven the whole lump,'[13] was bound to take the initiative and to 'mark' him[14]. The faithful were charged to 'withdraw from' him[15], to 'avoid' him[16], to 'have no intercourse with' him, to refuse 'even to eat with him.'[17] He was to be 'admonished'[18] and 'rebuked sharply,'[19] and if after repeated admoni-

[1] Acts ii 38, viii 16, x 48, xix 5 : cp. 1 Cor. i 13, vi 11.
[2] S. Mat. xxviii 19.
[3] Acts viii 17, xix 6 : cp. ii 38, 1 Cor. vi 11, Heb. vi 2.
[4] Tit. iii 5. [5] 1 Thess. iv 7.
[6] Rom. i 7, 1 Cor. i 2. [7] Phil. ii 1, 2 Cor. xiii 13, Eph. iv 3.
[8] Eph. iv 13. [9] Acts xxii 16.
[10] 1 Jo. iii 4 ἡ ἀνομία : v 17 ἀδικία.
[11] Rom. vi 2 sqq., 11 : 1 Jo. iii 6, 9, v 18.
[12] 1 Jo. i 9 : cp. Westcott *in loc.*
[13] 1 Cor. v 6.
[14] 2 Thess. iii 14, Rom. xvi 17. [15] 2 Thess. iii 6.
[16] Rom. xvi 17.
[17] 2 Thess. iii 14, 1 Cor. v 11 (cp. Deut. xvii 7).
[18] 1 Thess. v 14, Tit. iii 10.
[19] 1 Tim. v 20, 2 Tim. iv 2, Tit. i 13.

tions he was still impenitent, he was to be 'rejected.'[1] By a solemn sentence 'in the Name of our Lord Jesus' he is 'put away from among' the faithful and 'delivered to Satan,'[2] thrown back into 'the present evil world,'[3] the sphere of 'the god of this world.'[4] The types of offences which are indicated as the subject-matter of this discipline are; idolatry and grave moral offences—uncleanness, greed and rapacity, railing, and drunkenness—the doers of which 'shall not inherit the kingdom of God'[5]; heresy; factiousness or schism; and contumacious refusal, in face of the apostolic word and authority, to live christianly[6].

But the purpose of the Church in its disciplinary action was not only to conserve its own purity, but also to reclaim the offender and 'to renew him to repentance.'[7] The apostolic 'authority was given for edification, not for destruction'[8]; the offender was still 'a brother'[9]; and for the Church finally to lose one of its children was to 'be overreached by Satan.'[10] Consequently the offender was 'delivered to Satan' only for 'the destruction of the flesh,' 'that he might learn not to' offend again and 'that the spirit might be saved.'[11] On giving evidence of penitential 'sorrow,' the 'penalty' was removed and he was 'forgiven.'[12]

[1] Tit. iii 10: cp. S. Mat. xviii 15—17.

[2] 1 Cor. v 2, 5, 13, 1 Tim. i 20. [3] Gal. i 4.

[4] 2 Cor. iv 4: cp. 1 Jo. v 19.

[5] 1 Cor. v 11. The lists of sins which exclude from the inheritance of the kingdom of God in 1 Cor. vi 9 sq., Gal. v 19—21 ('the works of the flesh') are identical, in the types they include, with that of 1 Cor. v 11, except that the Galatian list adds a number of breaches of charity. Cp. the catalogue of those who are 'without' the Holy City, Apoc. xxi 27, xxii 15 (ix 21, xxi 8).

[6] 2 Thess. iii 6, 14.

[7] Heb. vi 6. [8] 2 Cor. xiii 10. [9] 2 Thess. iii 15.

[10] 2 Cor. ii 11. [11] 1 Cor. v 5, 1 Tim. i 20.

[12] 2 Cor. ii 5—10 *ἡ ἐπιτιμία...χαρίσασθαι καὶ παρακαλέσαι...τῇ λύπῃ... κεχάρισμαι δι' ὑμᾶς ἐν προσώπῳ* Χριστοῦ (*δι' ὑμᾶς* is explained by *v.* 5).

I

The only connected description in detail, surviving from the ante-Nicene period, of the whole process of the Christian Initiation is contained in the so-called *Egyptian Church Order*, that is to say, the *Apostolic Tradition* of S. Hippolytus[1], compiled in the first quarter of the 3rd century, and representing the contemporary usage of the Roman Church, and in general its long-standing tradition. This description, illustrated and supplemented from the fragmentary records and allusions of other writers of the period, is followed in the present section; and from it may be gathered what were the conditions on which admission to the Christian fellowship was given and accepted.

i. The first step in the process of initiation is the admission of the aspirant to the status of a catechumen. To this end, 'those who are approaching the new faith, to become hearers of the word, are first to be introduced to the doctors[2], before the people come into' church; 'and they are to be interrogated as to their motive, why they have come to the faith.' The purpose of this first interrogation is, we may assume, in part at least, to ascertain whether the candidates are acting entirely 'of free will' and not 'of constraint.'[3] Secondly, the sponsors, who 'are introducing them, must bear testimony to them, as to whether they are qualified to become

[1] See above p. 268 sq. Dom R. H. Connolly in 'The so-called Egyptian Church Order and Derived Documents' (*Texts and Studies* viii 4, Cambridge 1916) has since demonstrated the priority of the *Egyptian Church Order* to the other related documents and presented most of the evidence for the Hippolytean authorship. I refer to this *Church Order* as '*Order*' and by Funk's chapters and sections (*Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum* ii pp. 97 sqq.). I ought to add that, provisionally at least, unlike Dr Frere, I regard the whole of the 'First Church Order,' and not only the sections dealing with Ordinations, as Hippolytean, and as reproducing the Hippolytean original with very little modification.

[2] That is the *doctores audientium* or catechists: see below p. 331.

[3] Conc. Neocaes. *can.* 12 ἐκ προαιρέσεως...ἐξ ἀνάγκης.

hearers.' And thirdly, the candidates 'are to be examined touching their life.' And here, first, three questions are to be asked as to their condition: whether they are slaves, whether they are married, and whether they are in their right mind. If a candidate be the slave of a Christian master, he can only be accepted if the master gives his permission and a testimonial of good character; while, if the master be a pagan, the slave must be required 'to please his master,' that no scandal may arise. Married persons are to be required to be faithful to their partners; and an unmarried man must consent to live chastely or to contract a legal marriage. As for those not in their right mind—'if any have a devil, he shall not hear the word of the instruction until he be cleansed.' Secondly, the candidate is to be questioned with reference to a list of occupations, pursuits, and moral situations, which must be abandoned before one involved in them can be admitted to the catechumenate. The list is difficult to understand in detail. The oriental versions—and the Latin is wanting here—are difficult to interpret at some points: perhaps the translators did not themselves understand the text they were translating. And, it may be because we do not know the exact circumstances in which it was drawn up, it is not easy to see on what principle the list is constructed: why some things are included and others omitted. Still, the list as it stands serves sufficiently to illustrate the sort of precautions which were taken in admitting to the catechumenate, and the text itself recognizes its own possible incompleteness[1]; while not all the details are important for the present purpose. In the text the items are catalogued promiscuously. Rearranged and classified they fall into five groups, concerned with (1) idolatry, (2) the public service, (3) the public spectacles, (4) magic, (5) 'immorality.' It must be

[1] *Order* 11 § 16: 'if we have omitted anything, the circumstances will instruct you: for we all have the Spirit of God.'

remembered that Hippolytus was a rigourist, agreeing with Tertullian, as we shall see, in his general outlook. Consequently his rules may perhaps require to be in some measure discounted, before the common usage of the Church in detail is inferred from them.

(1) The ministers of the pagan cult, and those who supply its apparatus, are not to be accepted unless on condition of renouncing their practice. Hence 'a priest of idols or a guardian of idols must desist or be rejected.' The term 'priest of idols' would cover the members of the State priesthoods and the ministers of the special cults imported from the East, like those of the Magna Mater and of Isis; while 'guardian of idols' might refer to the *aeditui* or *custodes* of those temples which had no special priests, and those of the chapels of the *collegia*, or the menial guardians of the State temples generally[1]. And possibly the schemes of the Emperors Elagabalus and Alexander Severus[2] to bring about a universal combination of cults, including Judaism and Christianity, suggested the danger, or produced instances, of the attempt on the part of pagan priests of one sort and another to add Christian baptism to their other initiations. Or the reference may be rather to immigrant and unknown hierophants of obscure cults. Of those who supplied the appliances of pagan worship, 'a maker of idols or a painter must desist or be rejected.' The large class of workers in 'marble,' in 'gold, bronze, silver, ivory, wood, and whatever material is appropriated for the making of idols,'[3] besides 'painters[4]' employed in the decoration of

[1] See Marquardt *Staatsverwaltung* iii pp. 207 sqq. The guardians of the gods, who protected their images from theft, often alluded to with some satire by the Apologists (Aristides *Apol.* 3, *Ep. ad Diognet.* ii 2, 7, S. Cyp. *ad Demetr.* 14), were in some cases *neocori* or *aeditui* (Arnobius *adu. Nationes* vi 20, Firmic. Matern. *de Errore* 14), in others military sentinels (Tert. *Apol.* 29, *de Cor. Mil.* 11).

[2] Lampridius *Vita Elagab.* 3; *Vita Alex.* 39.

[3] Tertullian *de Spectac.* 2; *de Idol.* 8.

[4] Tert. *de Idol.* 8.

temples and images, are thus excluded, since no 'craft, no calling, no trade, which supplies anything for the furnishing forth or making of idols, can escape the name of idolatry.'[1]

(2) Of persons engaged in public services, the *Order* gives directions about the admission of magistrates, soldiers, and schoolmasters.

(*a*) From the days when the Christianity of Flavius Clemens in the reign of Domitian won for him a reputation for 'most contemptible indolence,' Christians notoriously avoided public office, with its inevitable pagan accompaniments[2]. The *Order* accordingly refuses admission to two classes of acting magistrates. First, 'magistrates having the power of the sword,' that is to say, in Italy chiefly the Prefect of the City and the Praetorian Prefect, and outside of Italy the governors of provinces[3]. The special ground of this exclusion, apart from the pagan obligations implied, is obviously that it is held to be unlawful for a Christian to sentence to death. Tertullian extends the prohibition further and includes even the infliction of *minutio capitis*, imprisonment, and perhaps fines, besides torture[4]: and Lactantius holds it unlawful to bring a capital charge[5]. And secondly, magistrates of cities who 'wear the purple' are excluded: viz. the curule magistrates of the City, and the *duumuiri* of the provincial *coloniae* and *municipia*, all of whom wore the purple-edged toga (*praetexta*)[6]. The ground of exclusion here is apparently the general one of the contact with paganism which was involved: the authorization and provision of sacrifices, and participation in them,

[1] Tert. *de Idol.* 11.

[2] Sueton. *Domitianus* 15 (Lightfoot *S. Clement* i pp. 35, 112 sq.); Origen *c. Celsum* viii 75; Tert. *Apol.* 38, 46, *de Idol.* 17 sq., *de Pallio* 5; Minucius Felix *Oct.* 8, 31

[3] Mommsen *Staatsrecht* ii p. 968.

[4] Tert. *de Idol.* 17.

[5] Lactant. *Instt.* vi 20.

[6] Marquardt *Staatsverwaltung* i p. 495.

the appointment of custodians of temples and the management of their revenues, the production and presidency of public spectacles, the decreeing of public festivals and rites[1]. Tertullian, while conceding that, if it were conceivable that these duties could be avoided, a Christian might lawfully accept a magistracy, yet proceeds further to ban 'the purple' in itself as defiled through and through by its associations with idolatry[2]. However, before the end of the 3rd century Christians were to be found who passed through the whole *cursus honorum* and became governors of provinces[3]; and—what Tertullian treated as inconceivable—they were, in some cases at least, dispensed from the obligation of sacrificing[4]. Yet, at the beginning of the 4th century the Council of Eliberis (Elvira) still required duumvirs to abstain from attendance at church during their year of office[5].

(*b*) Of the attitude of the Church in relation to the Army we know nothing until the reign of M. Aurelius, when Celsus in the *True Word* implies that Christians are something more than reluctant to undertake military service[6]. Twenty years later, Tertullian definitely urges that military service is incompatible with Christianity[7]. In the middle of the 3rd century Origen, in replying to Celsus, frankly accepts, and more than accepts, what Celsus had implied, and claims for Christians, as 'priests and worshippers of God,' the same exemption as the ministers of the pagan cult enjoyed[8]; while early in the next century Lactantius summarily dismisses the military calling as unlawful for

[1] Tert. *de Idol.* 17. [2] *Ibid.* 18.
[3] Eus. *Hist. Eccl.* viii 1 § 2, 9 § 7, 11 § 2.
[4] *Ibid.* viii 1 § 2.
[5] Conc. Elib. *can.* 56.
[6] Origen *c. Cels.* viii 73.
[7] Tert. *de Idol.* 19, *de Cor. Mil.* 11, *de Pallio* 5.
[8] Origen *c. Cels.* viii 74, *in 1 Cor. v 10* (*Journ. of Theol. Studies* ix p. 366): cp. Tert. *de Spect.* 16, Christians are 'sacerdotes pacis.'

the righteous[1]. The ground common to all three is that bloodshed is forbidden to a Christian; and with this, so far as they are explicit, Origen and Lactantius are content. But Tertullian has more to add: that officers are called upon to pronounce capital sentences; that the service involves all sorts of participation in pagan observances and association with pagan institutions; that the military oath (*sacramentum*)[2], and the 'disc' (*signum*) which signifies it, are incompatible with the Christian *sacramentum* and the *signaculum* of the cross; and it is on the two last of these grounds that at the end of the century some Christians are found refusing or renouncing military service and suffering martyrdom in consequence[3]. On the other hand, there were Christian soldiers in the armies of M. Aurelius[4]; Clement of Alexandria assumes that, as there are Christian husbandmen and sailors, so there are Christian soldiers[5]; and Tertullian himself makes it clear enough that there were plenty of them[6]: he is willing, on occasion, even to exaggerate the facts and to make apologetic capital out of them[7], and out of the further fact that the Church prays for the strength of the imperial armies[8]. After the Peace of Gallienus (261), as in other public services, so in the army an increasing number of Christians were to be found. The martyrs at the end of the century were exceptional, and, of them, Maximilian refused to criticize his brethren who served in the army and was

[1] Lactant. *Instt.* vi 20.

[2] There are two allusions to the contents of the military *sacramentum* which I have not seen alluded to in any account of it: S. Justin M. *Apol.* i 39 γελοῖον ἦν δὴ πρᾶγμα, ὑμῖν [sc. the Emperors] μὲν τοὺς συντιθεμένους καὶ καταλεγομένους στρατιώτας καὶ πρὸ τῆς ἑαυτῶν ζωῆς καὶ γονέων καὶ πατρίδος καὶ πάντων τῶν οἰκείων τὴν ὑμετέραν ἀσπάζεσθαι ὁμολογίαν: Tert. *de Cor. Mil.* 11 et eierare patrem ac matrem et omnem proximum.

[3] *Acta S. Maximiliani* and *S. Marcelli* in Ruinart *Acta sincera*, Amsterdam 1713, pp. 300 sqq.

[4] Eus. *H.E.* v. 5.

[5] Clem. Al. *Protrept.* x 100 § 4.

[6] Tert. *Apol.* 5, 42: *ad Scap.* 4.

[7] Tert. *Apol.* 37.

[8] *Ib.* 30: cp. *Acta disp. Achatii* 1.

concerned only for his own conscience; while it was the wide prevalence of the Faith in the army that gave occasion for the beginnings of the Great Persecution[1]. After the victory of the Milvian Bridge and the Edict of Milan, the Council of Arles in 314 determined 'that those who in peace throw down their arms are to be excommunicated[2]'; so that the first formal ecclesiastical decision relating to the matter is a decisive recognition of the lawfulness of military service. To return to Tertullian: in 198 he puts the questions whether a Christian may enlist, and whether a soldier, even a private, who is not called upon to sacrifice or to pass capital sentences, may be 'admitted to the faith'; and his own answer to both questions is 'No.'[3] A few years later he allows that a soldier may be baptized, but he adds the condition that he must either forthwith quit the service 'as many have already done,' or use all his ingenuity to avoid doing anything contrary to God—an alternative which in Tertullian's mouth sounds ironical,—or by open mutiny court martyrdom[4]. The Hippolytean *Order* adopts the same general attitude as Tertullian, but, in accepting the second of his three alternatives, defines and severely limits it. Accordingly it lays down that no Christian or catechumen may voluntarily enlist; so that a person accepting admission to the catechumenate pledges himself not to choose a military career. At the same time a soldier as such is not excluded from the catechumenate and baptism; only, a Christian soldier must refuse to 'do homicide,' that is, apparently, to act as an executioner[5].

[1] Eus. *H.E.* viii 1 § 7, 4 § 2 sqq.: Lactant. *de Morte Persec.* 10.

[2] Conc. Arelat. i *can.* 3. The above at least is the *prima facie* meaning: see Dom Leclercq's note in Hefele *Histoire des Conciles* i p. 282.

[3] Tert. *de Idol.* 19. [4] Tert. *de Cor. Mil.* 11.

[5] The text (11 § 9) adds a further condition, or two further conditions, which evidently puzzled the oriental translators, so that it is difficult to make out what it was. I suspect it was: 'and if he receives a command he must be prompt to execute it and so not fail to keep his oath'—in short, he must endeavour to be a good soldier.

(*c*) Tertullian, in his usual sweeping manner, regards the 'profession of letters' in all its grades, those of *grammatista*, of *grammaticus*, and of *rhetor* alike, as incompatible with Christianity: and this on two grounds. First, the matter of instruction is pagan; in expounding the poets the master 'preaches the gods of the nations, and expounds their names, genealogies, fables, and trappings'; in short he 'catechizes about idols.' And secondly, the yearly course of school-life involves the observance of pagan festivals and customs: the *Quinquatrus* or *feriae puerorum* and the *Saturnalia* are school-holidays; at these and other festivals pupils bring presents to their teacher; on the feast of Flora the school-room is hung with flowers; the pupil's first fee is a *mineruale*; and so on[1]. The Hippolytean *Order* as usual agrees with Tertullian in its general view, but moderates the practical conclusion. It rules that it is desirable that the schoolmaster abandon his profession; but if he has no craft to fall back upon for his living, it allows him in spite of his occupation to be admitted to the catechumenate.

(3) The Christian writers of this period are unanimous in reprobating the public Spectacles[2]. They generally state it as a fact or allude to it as notorious that Christians have renounced[3] the circus, the stadium, the theatre, and the amphitheatre. But there were exceptions: and the *Didascalia* is at pains to warn Christians against the theatre[4]; while Tertullian and Novatian had occasion to write tractates exposing the arguments and expostulating with the practice of some

[1] Tert. *de Idol.* 10: Marquardt *Privatleben* i p. 92.

[2] Athenagoras *Legatio* 30: Theophilus *ad Autolycum* iii 15: Tatian *adu. Graec.* 22 sq.: Tertullian *Apol.* 38, 42: Minucius Felix *Octauius* 12, 37: S. Cyprian *ad Donat.* 7 sq.; Lactantius *Instt.* vi 20.

[3] The Spectacles are expressly treated as covered by the baptismal renunciations: Tert. *de Spect.* 4, 13, 24, Novatian *de Spect.*

[4] *Didascalia* ii 62.

who claimed the liberty to frequent the Spectacles[1]. There were three broad grounds for denouncing them: their origins and associations, their character, and their effect on the spectator. Their origins, associations, and settings alike were pagan and idolatrous[2]. In character, the gladiatorial contests and the beast-baitings (*uenationes*) were cruel and brutal and bloody, the stage impure and lascivious[3]. The effect on the spectators was to stir their blood-lust and deaden their human feelings in the amphitheatre; to defile eyes and ears and imagination in the theatre; and to let loose the *insania* and *furor*, the mad excitement and infatuation, which rent the Empire into factions over the chariot-races of the circus[4]. As we have seen already, the necessity of providing Spectacles was one of the reasons why Christians could not accept magistracies[5]. But if a Christian might neither be a spectator nor provide a Spectacle, still less could he participate as a performer—whether actor, charioteer, gladiator, or beast-baiter: and Tertullian reminds his readers that, even civilly, all these occupations were ignominious and involved disabilities[6]. Accordingly the *Order* rejects, unless they quit their occupation, actors, gladiators and their trainers (*lanistae*) and public slaves (*publici*, δημόσιοι) employed

[1] Tert. *de Spectaculis*: Novatian *de Spectaculis* (in the appendix to the Works of S. Cyprian).

[2] Tert. *de Spect.* 5—15: Minucius *Oct.* 37 § 11: Novat. *de Spect.* 4 sq.

[3] Tert. *Apol.* 38 insania circi, impudicitia theatri, atrocitate arenae, uanitate xysti: *de Pudic.* 7 quadrigarii furoris et gladiatorii cruoris et scenicae foeditatis et xysticae uanitatis: *de Spect.* 20 furor...impudicitia ...insolentia...immisericordia. Perhaps Tertullian and Novatian (*de Spect.* 8) are alone in expressly denouncing the athletic contests of the stadium and the xystus (which, besides, were not very popular amongst the Latins). Novatian adds musical contests (c. 4).

[4] See Tert. *de Spect.* 16 sqq.; S. Cyp. *ad Don.* 7 sq.: Novat. *de Spect.* 5—8. On the Green and Blue factions (Novat. *de Spect.* 5 lites in coloribus) see Friedländer *Roman life and manners* ii pp. 27 sqq. For a famous instance of the effect of the amphitheatre on the spectators see S. Aug. *Confessiones* vi 8.

[5] Above p. 324.

[6] Tert. *de Spect.* 22.

about the arena, beast-baiters (*uenatores*, *bestiarii*, κυνηγοί), and charioteers (*aurigae*, *agitatores*, ἡνίοχοι); as well as perhaps some other classes, for the list is difficult to decipher in the versions. At the beginning of the next century the Council of Eliberis has occasion to enforce the prohibition as it affects charioteers (*aurigae*) and one class of actors (*pantomimi*)[1].

(4) Magic was regarded not only as a deception, but as a deception manipulated by demons. It was demons who inspired the soothsayer, personated the dead recalled by the necromancer, manœuvred the occurrences to be interpreted as omens, and so on[2]. Consequently in all its forms the practice of Magic was impossible for a Christian[3], and must be renounced by the candidate for initiation. The *Order* therefore directs that 'no magician be admitted' to the catechumenate, whatever his method of procedure: whether he be an 'enchanter' (ἐπαοιδός) operating with spells and incantations; an 'astrologer' (ἀστρολόγος) deducing destinies from the position of the stars; a 'diviner' (μάντις), a reader of omens, whether in the behaviour and notes of birds (*auspex*, *augur*) or in the entrails of victims (*haruspex*) or in any exceptional circumstance; an 'interpreter of dreams'; or a 'maker of phylacteries,' that is, of charms and amulets. Besides these, some other varieties are referred to under phrases which are difficult to interpret: but it is probable that one of them is the sort of migrant practitioner referred to by Celsus, who collected a crowd in the square and displayed his effects for a few coppers[4]; another, the snake-charmer.

(5) Finally, brothel-keepers, harlots, profligates, and those guilty of unnatural vice, are to be rejected;

[1] Conc. Elib. *can.* 62.

[2] Minucius Felix *Oct.* 26 sq.: Tert. *Apol.* 22 sq., *de Anima* 57: S. Cyp. *Quod idola dii non sint* 7: Lactant. *Instt.* ii 16.

[3] Tert. *Apol.* 35, 43, *de Idol.* 9.

[4] Origen *c. Cels.* i 68.

unless, of course, they undertake to amend. A slave who is her master's concubine may be accepted, provided that she has not exposed her children, but has brought them up, and that she is faithful to her partner; while the man must be rejected, unless he consents to 'desist and be legally married.'

The examination finished and the doctors satisfied, the candidate is admitted to the catechumenate and 'made a Christian' by prayer and the imposition of the hand[1].

ii. So admitted, the catechumen had his place in the congregation, and stood 'in the order of the catechumens'[2] at the bottom of the church[3]; where at the Liturgy, on Sundays and Festivals, Station-days and Vigils, he 'heard' the Lessons and the Gospel, and the Sermon which followed, and had his part in the prayer and imposition of the hand with which his order was dismissed before the common-prayers, the offertory, and the mysteries[4]. If he was invited to a 'Lord's Supper,' an *Agape*, in the house of one of the faithful, while he might not sit down with the faithful, he received exorcized bread and a cup[5]. He was under obligation to live honestly and do every Christian good work[6], and was subject to the discipline of the Church[7]. In days of persecution he need have no misgiving; for if he

[1] Conc. Elib. *can.* 39: Conc. Arelat. i *can.* 6. Origen at Caesarea (*c. Cels.* iii 51) contemplates a period of probation preliminary to the full admission of the catechumen.

[2] Conc. Neocaes. *can.* 5.

[3] Origen *in Mat.* xi 18: Eus. *H.E.* x 4 § 63.

[4] For the presence of the catechumens see Origen's homilies *passim*: for the distinction between the 'mass of the catechumens' and that 'of the faithful' see S. Justin Mart. *Apol.* 65 compared with 67; Tert. *Praesc.* 41, where it is noted that the Marcionites ignored the distinction (cp. S. Jer. *in Gal. vi 6*); Origen *hom.* xiii *in Exod.* 3, *hom.* ix *in Lev.* 10, where he distinguishes those of his hearers who know the mysteries from those who do not; *Didascalia* ii 38 § 4, 39 § 6.

[5] *Order* 19 sq.

[6] *Order* 15: Origen *hom.* vi *in Lev.* 2, iv *in Ies. Nav.* 1, vi *in Ezech.* 5, xxii *in Luc.*

[7] Conc. Neocaes. *can.* 5: Nicaen. *can.* 14.

made the good confession and suffered martyrdom 'he will be justified, being baptized in his own blood.'[1]

As his name implies, the catechumen is one distinctively under instruction. This instruction he received in two forms. First, as we have just seen, he was present at the first part of the Liturgy—what later was called the 'Mass of the Catechumens'—consisting almost entirely of instruction. He shared therefore with the faithful in the ordinary teaching of the Church, which was conveyed by readings from the Holy Scriptures, followed by exposition and comment. Secondly, particular provision was made for the instruction of the catechumens. Churches had their Catechists or *Doctores audientium*, whether laymen or clergymen[2], and Readers were attached to the Catechists to assist them in their ministrations[3]. This ministration was executed at periodic *missae catechumenorum*, celebrated apart from the Liturgy; and at them the Catechist gave his instruction; after which the catechumens prayed in silence, and the Catechist dismissed them with imposition of his hand and prayer.

The subject-matter of the Catechesis was naturally twofold, moral and doctrinal: it could be summarized in passing as 'God the Father,' 'the Coming of the Son of God,' and 'the ordering of conduct.'[4] In the earlier stage of the catechumenate the moral teaching predominated: 'reproof of manners, amendment of conduct,

[1] *Order* 14: Tert. *de Bapt.* 16: Origen *in Mat.* xvi 6: *de Rebaptismate* 11, 14: Eus. *H.E.* vi 4 § 3.

[2] *Order* 14 'whether the doctor be an ecclesiastic or a layman let him do thus,' i.e. impose his hand: *Ap. Const.* viii 32 § 17 reproduces the passage thus: ὁ διδάσκων εἰ καὶ λαϊκὸς ᾖ, ἔμπειρος δὲ τοῦ λόγου καὶ τὸν τρόπον σεμνός, διδασκέτω· '"Εσονται' γὰρ 'πάντες διδακτοὶ Θεοῦ.'

[3] S. Cyp. *Ep.* xxix. Lessons from Holy Scripture are not mentioned in the *Order*; but they may be inferred, in Africa at least, from the existence of *lectores doctorum audientium*. The *Catecheses* of S. Cyril of Jerusalem in the next century are each preceded by a Lesson. (Hartel in his index, *s.vv.* 'audientes,' 'doctores,' has invented *doctores audientes* and *lectores doctores*!)

[4] S. Irenaeus *Haer.* iv 23 § 2.

and the first elements of a religious conversation and a simple faith,' was 'the milk of the Church, the children's first elements for beginners.'[1] It was only when 'the fallow ground' had been 'broken up' by this instruction and by corresponding practice that 'the word' was imparted 'concerning the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost, the word concerning resurrection, punishment, and rest, the word concerning the law and the prophets, and the details of what is written.'[2] But, throughout, the teaching was adapted to individual capacities; and while some were never able to advance beyond an elementary knowledge, others went further and were instructed 'demonstratively, by means of question and answer.'[3]

An early specimen of the type of elementary moral instruction imparted may perhaps be found in the *Two Ways*, which is adopted by the *Didache* for the purpose of a prebaptismal Catechesis[4]. Its teaching falls into two parts, the 'Way of Life' and the 'Way of Death.' The 'Way of Life' is described in a series of precepts, with considerable repetition, designed apparently to impress the principles on the mind of the catechumen by presenting them from different points of view and in different applications. The first section begins with the precept to love God, and to love one's neighbour as oneself, and expands and illustrates the latter from the negative 'Golden Rule' and the Sermon on the Mount. The second section—'the second commandment of the teaching'—is a series of negative precepts containing, enlarging, and applying, the second table of the Decalogue. A third section is a 'hedge of the law,' deprecating lesser sins as in principle 'like to' greater

[1] Origen *hom.* v *in Iudic.* 6.

[2] Origen *hom.* v *in Ier.* 13.

[3] Origen *c. Cels.* vi 10. In the last words Origen is obviously alluding to the great Catechetical Schools of Alexandria and Caesarea.

[4] *Didache* 1—5; *Epist. of Barnabas* 18—20.

sins and containing the germ of them. The last section is a collection of precepts on the honour due to teachers of the Word of God, peaceableness, generosity, the duty of parents to children, the mutual duty of master and servant, faithfulness to the divine commandments, and confession of sins. The 'Way of Death' is described simply by two lists, one of twenty-two sins, the other of nineteen classes of sinners[1].

While no detailed description of the doctrinal catechesis survives from this period[2], yet it is not difficult to determine its general character and its essential content. We have already seen Origen's description of the seed which is to be sown when the fallow ground has been broken up. And this may be further illustrated by his statement of the essential faith: 'First of all believe that God is One, who created and framed all things, and brought all things into being out of nothing: and it is necessary also to believe that Jesus Christ is Lord, and to believe the whole truth about Him, touching the Godhead and touching the Manhood: and we ought also to believe in the Holy Ghost: and that, since we are free, we are punished for our sins and honoured for our well-doing.'[3] The *Didascalia* supplies a summary of the heads of essential Christian teaching in a formula purporting to have been given to the Church by the Apostles in view of the rise of heresies: 'to worship God almighty and Jesus Christ his Son and the Holy Ghost, and to use the Holy Scriptures, and to believe the resurrection of the dead.'[4]

[1] Other summaries of Christian morals are, e.g., Aristides *Apol.* 15: S. Justin M. *Apol.* i 14—17: Hermas *Pastor* mand. 8. Cp. S. Cyp. *Test.* iii.

[2] The earliest surviving example is the *Catecheses* of S. Cyril of Jerusalem, of the middle of the 4th century. The *Epideixis* of S. Irenaeus, lately recovered in an Armenian version (*Texte u. Unters.* xxxi, 1907: Barthoulot and Tixeront *Saint Irénée: Démonstration de la Prédication apostolique*, Paris 1917), is not a catechesis, but it excellently suggests the sort of catechesis Irenaeus would have given.

[3] Origen *in Ioan.* xxxii 9.

[4] *Didasc.* vi 12 § 1. See again S. Iren. *Haer.* iv 33 § 7.

But, what is at once more important and more definite, the outline and the essential content of the Catechesis is contained in the 'Rule of Faith' and its condensation in the Creed. The Creed was constructed for the purposes of the baptismal confession, and is, therefore, in its nature a summary of the instruction which was imparted to the catechumen with a view to his confession. The 'Rule of the Truth' which Irenaeus describes is what the Christian 'received in baptism'[1]; and the Creed which Eusebius submitted to the fathers of Nicaea was what he received 40 or 50 years before 'both in the catechesis and when he was being baptized' at Caesarea[2]. The Roman Creed, the basis of the 'Apostles' Creed,' is confessedly older than the middle of the 2nd century and perhaps as old as the beginning of it. It was, obviously, the model of all ancient western baptismal creeds. Whether it was also the model and source of eastern creeds, or was itself derived from an eastern source, or whether like conditions in East and West issued independently in like results, all this is still in question, and it is unnecessary for the present purpose to discuss it here. It is enough to say that the evidence for the western creed happens to be earlier and fuller than for the eastern; and that by the time our knowledge of eastern forms becomes, not complete, but sufficient, towards the end of the 3rd century, the eastern type of creed differs from the western in some particulars of scope and form.

The text of the old Roman Creed is as follows: 'I believe in God the Father almighty: and in Christ Jesus, his only Son our Lord: who was born of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary, who was crucified under Pontius Pilate and was buried, and the third day rose again from the dead, ascended into heaven, sitteth at the right-hand of the Father, whence he will come

[1] S. Iren. *Haer.* i 9 § 4.

[2] Socrates *Hist. eccl.* i 8.

to judge the quick and the dead: and in the Holy Ghost, the holy Church, the forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of the flesh.'[1] No complete text of an eastern creed of the 3rd century survives; but the characteristics of the eastern type are illustrated by the formula presented by Eusebius to the Nicene Council as expressing the faith in which he had been catechized and baptized at some date after 265: 'We[2] believe in one God the Father almighty, the maker of all things, both visible and invisible. And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Word of God, God of God, Light of Light, Life of Life, the only-begotten Son, the first-born of all creation, begotten of the Father before all worlds, through whom also all things were made: who for our salvation was incarnate and took up his conversation among men, and suffered, and rose again the third day, and ascended to the Father, and will come again in glory to judge the quick and the dead. We believe also in one Holy Ghost.'[3] The clauses here wanting can be illustrated by the Egyptian Creed, imperfectly cited by Alexander of Alexandria in his letter to Alexander of Byzantium in 323: 'the one and only catholic, to wit the apostolic, Church: the resurrection from the dead.'[4]

This being the ground-plan on which the Catechesis was to be built up, the 'seed' which was to be sown and developed in the course of it, we are no doubt justified in finding some suggestions as to the character

[1] S. Epiphan. *Haer.* lxxii 3 (Marcellus of Ancyra): Rufinus *Expositio symboli apostolici*. But the evidence of the Hippolytean *Order* suggests that these fourth-century citations do not represent quite the oldest form of the Roman Creed: see below p. 344.

[2] Whether Eusebius was reciting the creed of Caesarea or only himself throwing into creed-form the substance of the teaching he had received, he would naturally say 'we,' since he was proposing a formula for adoption by the Council. It seems still necessary to insist that it is an illusion to suppose that eastern creeds have 'we,' western 'I.' The fact is that conciliar creeds, whether eastern or western, say 'we,' baptismal creeds 'I.' In the Liturgy some churches say the one, some the other.

[3] Socrates *Hist. eccl.* i 8. [4] Theodoret *Hist. eccl.* i 4.

of this development in such a large statement of the Rule of Faith as that made by Origen at the beginning of the *de Principiis*. The content of 'the preaching of the Church,' then, is this: 'first, that there is *one God*, who created and framed all things, and who, when nothing was, made all things to be; God from the first creation and constitution of the world; the God of all the righteous, Adam, Abel, Seth, Enos, Enoch, Noah, Shem, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, the twelve patriarchs, Moses, and the prophets: and that this God in the last days, as He had promised before by his prophets, sent *our Lord Jesus Christ*, first to call Israel, and then, after the unbelief of the people of Israel, the Gentiles as well. This God, just and good, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, himself gave the Law and the Prophets and the Gospels, who is also the God both of the Apostles and of the Old and the New Testament. Then, that *Jesus Christ* himself, who came, *was born of the Father before all creation*: who, after He had ministered to the Father in the constitution of all things (for *through Him all things were made*), in the last times emptying Himself was made man and *was incarnate* while He was God, and, albeit made man, remained what He was, God. He assumed a body like our body, differing in this only, that it was *born of a virgin and the Holy Ghost*. And that this Jesus Christ was *born and suffered* in reality, and it was not in mere appearance that He endured this death common to all, since He really *died*; for, He really *rose again from the dead*, and after the resurrection, having companied with his disciples, He was *taken up*. Then they have handed down that the *Holy Ghost* is associated in honour and dignity with the Father and the Son... Indeed it is most clearly preached in the churches that this Spirit has inspired every one of the saints, whether prophets or apostles, and that there has not been one Spirit in the ancients and another in those who were inspired at the coming of Christ. Next after this,

that the soul, having its own substance and life, when it has departed from this world, will be disposed of in accordance with its merits, whether to obtain the inheritance of *eternal life* and blessedness, if its deeds have bestowed this on it, or to be given over to eternal fire and punishments, if the guilt of crimes have diverted it to this end: but also that there will be a time of *the resurrection of the dead*, when the body which is now being sown in corruption will rise in incorruption, and what is being sown in dishonour will rise in glory.' Origen adds some further topics, included indeed in 'the preaching,' but most of them involving questions to which the apostolic tradition supplied no answer[1]. These need not be enumerated. In this and like statements[2], besides their suggestion of the character of the development of the topics of the Creed, there are two other points to be noted. First, the form and content of the statement is in part determined by opposition to current heresy: there is but one God, who is the Creator, and is both just and good, the God of both testaments, and the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ—this as against Marcionism: Christ was born, suffered, died, and rose again, in reality and not in seeming—this as against all Docetic theories. And we may assume that this polemical element had a place in the catechesis; and in fact that what is more or less only implicit in such a statement as that just cited from Origen was made explicit, and the catechumen was overtly warned and fortified against the arguments and allurements of heresy[3]. Secondly, the reference to the Old Testament is to be noted; and in particular that the one God, 'who is the God both of the Apostles and of the Old

[1] Origen *de Principiis* I praef. 4. This whole statement is of course only the programme of what is expounded at length in the treatise.

[2] E.g. S. Iren. *Haer.* i 10 § 1, iii 4 § 1, 16 § 5, iv 33 § 7, *Epideixis* 6: Tert. *Praesc.* 13.

[3] S. Cyril of Jerusalem treats at length of heresies in *Catecheses* vi 12—34, xvi 6—10.

and the New Testament,' sent our Lord 'as He had promised before by the prophets.' This is emphasized by Origen primarily of course in view of Marcionism and its rejection of the Old Testament. But it serves to suggest another feature which must have marked the catechesis. In the beginning the Old Testament was the Bible, the authoritative Holy Scripture, of the Church, only equalled or surpassed in authority by the words of the Lord Himself; and when as the result of a gradual process practically completed under the stress of the Gnostic controversy, a collection of apostolic writings was marked off and definitely recognized as authoritative, this collection did not displace the Old Testament, but was recognized as 'canonical,' i.e. as a New Testament on a level with the Old. The Law and the Prophets retained their authority and filled a large place in the life of the Church as a source and an instrument of its teaching. The Old Testament supplied an expression of the doctrine of Creation and a story of the providence and of the 'dispensations' of God which culminated 'in the fullness of the times'[1]; interpreted as it was allegorically, it yielded new combinations of Christian doctrines and new insights into them[2]; and through 'the argument from prophecy' it provided, not only material for the purposes of Apology whether addressed to Jews[3] or to pagans[4], but also a method of positive instruction within the Church, by which the facts of the Gospel and the Apostolic mission were imparted and interpreted[5]. And we may be sure that something of all this found a place in the catechesis. Origen, as we have seen, includes among the 'seeds' to be 'sown' when the 'fallow-ground has been broken up' 'the word concerning the Law and the Prophets,

[1] S. Iren. *Haer.* iv.
[2] See especially Origen's homilies and commentaries *passim.*
[3] E.g. S. Justin M. *Dial. c. Tryph.*: S. Athan. *de Incarn.* 33—40.
[4] E.g. S. Justin M. *Apol.* i 31—52.
[5] E.g. S. Iren. *Epideixis.*

and the details of what is written'; while S. Cyprian in referring to the second book of his *Testimonia*,—a collection of passages of the Old Testament with corresponding passages of the New Testament, 'containing the mystery of Christ: that He has come who was announced according to the Scriptures, and has done and completed all the things by which it was foretold that He could be recognized and known,'—expresses the hope that his collection may be profitable to the reader by enabling him 'to trace the first outlines of the Faith.'[1]

The catechumenate lasted in each case normally for two or three years[2]. But it could be lengthened or shortened according to circumstances. It might be shortened if the catechumen displayed exceptional zeal and persistency, since 'it is not the time but the manner that is to be estimated'[3]; or again in case of sickness and danger of death baptism might be conferred immediately[4]. On the other hand the period was lengthened for those who fell into such sin as, in the case of the faithful, would involve the application of the penitential discipline[5]. And by the early years of the 4th century the custom had perhaps already arisen, which so widely prevailed later on in the century, by which catechumens put off their baptism indefinitely and lived meanwhile as mere 'hearers,' receiving only the ordinary instruction of the Church in the sermon, and not the special catechesis, and being dismissed after the sermon summarily without prayer. Anyhow there were already by that time two classes of catechumens, the 'hearers' as well as the 'kneelers.'[6]

[1] S. Cyp. *Testim.* i prooem.: quae legenti interim prosint ad prima fidei liniamenta formanda.

[2] *Order* 12 § 1 (3 years), Conc. Elib. *can.* 42 (2 years).

[3] *Order* 12 οὐχ ὁ χρόνος ἀλλ' ὁ τρόπος κρίνεται (*Ap. Const.* viii 32 § 16).

[4] Conc. Elib. *can.* 42.

[5] Conc. Elib. *can.* 4, Neocaes. *can.* 5, Nicaen. *can.* 14.

[6] Conc. Neocaes. *can.* 5 γόνυ κλίνων...ἀκροώμενος. Cp. p. 368.

iii. Already at the beginning of the 3rd century Baptism was administered normally only at Easter[1]. At some date before Easter, the doctors selected those of the catechumens whom they judged to be sufficiently advanced to be qualified for initiation at the coming Baptism: their life was again scrutinized, their sponsors being called upon to bear their testimony as to whether during their catechumenate they had 'lived honestly, had honoured widows, visited the sick, and done all good works.' If the result of the scrutiny was satisfactory, the selected catechumens were to 'hear the Gospel.' This then seems to be the moment at which the character of the catechesis was changed, and from being predominantly moral and disciplinary, became instruction in the intimate doctrine of the Church and the mysteries of the faith. In the Hippolytean *Order* there is nothing to shew how long this period of instruction lasted; but some hundred years later, in 325, there existed a Lent, already so familiar that 'before Lent' could be used as a rough indication of date[2]. Now, just as the 50th day after Easter gave its name to the whole preceding festal season extending from Easter to Whitsunday, which was therefore called *Pentecoste*[3], so the season preceding Easter must have derived its name of τεσσαρακοστή from its first day, approximately the 40th before Easter. This 40th day, therefore, must have been in some way a marked one; and there can be little question that it was from the first, as it certainly was in the middle of the 4th century[4], the day on which the candidates for baptism at the coming Easter were selected and entered on the second stage of their cate-

1 Tert. *de Bapt.* 19: S. Hippol. *in Dan.* i 16.

2 Conc. Nicaen. *can.* 5 πρὸ τῆς τεσσαρακοστῆς.

3 Tert. *de Bapt.* 19 exinde Pentecoste...latissimum spatium est, *de Idol.* 14, *de Cor. Mil.* 3, *de Orat.* 18: Origen *c. Cels.* viii 22: Conc. Nic. *can.* 20.

4 S. Cyr. Hier. *Procatechesis* 4.

chumenate[1]. If this was so, Lent was in its origin the period of the more intimate instruction of the catechumens.

Beside the more esoteric instruction, this period was marked by two other features. First, the catechumens were daily exorcised by prayer and the imposition of the hand[2]. And secondly, it is likely that it was now especially that they disciplined themselves with fasting and penitential exercises, which from early days had been prescribed as part of the immediate preparation for baptism[3]. Towards the end of the period, perhaps on the Wednesday before Easter, the candidates individually underwent a final examination, this time on the part of the bishop, and those who failed to satisfy him were set aside[4]. On Thursday, they were directed to bathe; and on Friday, the great *Parasceve*[5], they fasted

[1] Of course it is possible that in the Nicene canon ἡ τεσσαρακοστή still means only 'the 40th day,' and that it was not till a few years later that it meant the season.

[2] The exorcism of all converts is mentioned for the first time in the Hippolytean *Order*. Perhaps it was adopted in opposition to the pagan revival of the 3rd cent. Both within and without the Church men's minds were obsessed by the sense of the presence and operation of demons in the world: see e.g. Tert. *Apol.* 22 and Porphyry in Euseb. *Praep. evangel.* iv 22. In exorcising pagans the Church was taking the world very much at its own valuation. For the form of prayers of exorcism see S. Justin M. *Apol.* ii 6, 8, *Tryph.* 85, 121: S. Iren. *Haer.* ii 32 § 3: Tert. *Apol.* 23: Origen *c. Cels.* i 6, 67. For the imposition of hands cp. Tert. *Apol.* 23: Origen *hom.* xxiv *in Iesu Nav.* 1: *Sentt. epp.* 37.

[3] *Didache* 7 § 4: S. Justin M. *Apol.* i 61 § 2: Tert. *de Bapt.* 20: cp. Origen *hom.* xxi *in Luc.* Tertullian's *de Paenitentia* is addressed to catechumens, in part to exhort them to serious repentance before baptism.

[4] The bishop's act is described by ἐξορκίζει (retained in the Sahidic version), which in the Eth. and Arab. versions is rendered by the older, non-technical, meaning of the word, 'put them on their oath.' If this is right, as it seems to be, it may be explained by Tert. *de Cor. Mil.* 3 (cp. *de Spect.* 13), where we find that the catechumens made their renunciation of the devil and his pomps and angels, not only at the font, but also 'aliquanto prius in ecclesia sub antistitis manu'; so that the 'oath' demanded is the vow of renunciation. (For the novelty of the Christian *exorcizare* see Ulpian in *Digest* 1 xiii 1 si, ut uulgari uerbo impostorum utar, exorcizauit.)

[5] Tert. *de Ieiun.* 14. For the Paschal Fast see *Order* 25: and S. Iren.

along with the faithful. On Saturday, the *Pascha*[1], the catechumens were assembled in the presence of the bishop, and were directed to kneel and pray. The bishop, laying his hand on them, made a solemn exorcism of all evil spirits, and breathing on their faces signed them with the cross[2], and raised them from their knees. The period of the catechumenate is over, and the catechumens are ready for baptism.

iv. At nightfall the faithful and the catechumens assembled in church for the Paschal Vigil[3]. The service of the Vigil, a prolonged *missa catechumenorum*, consisting of lessons and hymns and a sermon[4], lasted till cockcrow[5]. At cockcrow the ministers and the catechumens resort to the baptistery; and there the bishop first 'prays over' the water[6], which is if possible to be running water, flowing into the tank[7]; and then he consecrates the 'Oil of thanksgiving,'[8] and exorcises the 'Oil of exorcism.' Meanwhile the catechumens undress. After these preliminaries follow three ceremonies, which resume and summarize the significance

ap. Eus. *H. E.* v 24 § 12: Tert. *de Ieiun.* 2, 13, 14: S. Dion. Al. *Ep. canon.* 1: *Didascalia* v 18. It was of two days, Friday and Saturday, at the beginning of the 3rd cent.; the preceding 4 days were added later in the century.

[1] *Order* 25: Tert. *de Orat.* 18, *de Ieiun.* 13 sq.: cp. *Didasc.* v 17.

[2] For exsufflation in exorcism cp. Tert. *Apol.* 23; for the sign of the cross, Lactant. *Instt.* iv 27.

[3] For the Paschal Vigil (διανυκτέρευσις, παννυχίς) see Tert. *ad Uxor.* ii 4: Eus. *H. E.* ii 17 § 21, vi 9 § 2, 34, *Vita Constant.* iv 57: *Didascalia* v 19: Lactant. *Instt.* vii 19. A great deal of confusion would be avoided if it were clearly realized that the exact point at issue in the Paschal controversy of the end of the 2nd cent. was whether this vigil should be kept on the night 13–14 of the moon or on the following Saturday–Sunday.

[4] Eus. *H. E.* ii 17 § 22: *Didasc.* v 19.

[5] Cp. S. Dion. Al. *Ep. canon.* 1.

[6] Consecration of the water: Tert. *de Bapt.* 4: S. Cyp. *Ep.* lxx 1: *Sentt. epp.* 18.

[7] Cp. *Didache* 7: Tert. *de Bapt.* 4: *Clem. Recogn.* iii 67, iv 32, vi 15.

[8] I.e. oil consecrated, like the Eucharist, by the recitation of a thanksgiving: S. Cyp. *Ep.* lxx 2 eucharistia est unde baptizati unguntur oleum in altari sanctificatum: Tert. *de Bapt.* 7 benedicta unctio: *Clem. Recogn.* iii 67.

and results of the catechumenate: the renunciation, the exorcism, and the confession of faith. (1) A presbyter takes each of the candidates and bids him make his renunciation. The terms of the renunciation varied locally. The Hippolytean form is 'I renounce thee, Satan, and all thy service[1] and all thy works': Tertullian's African form had 'thee and thy pomp and thine angels,' S. Cyprian's, apparently, 'thee and the world and its pomps and pleasures'; while Origen's Caesarean form included the devil, his pomps, his works, and his service and pleasures[2]. However expressed, this renunciation was a comprehensive repudiation of paganism and all its ways and appliances. (2) The presbyter anoints the catechumen with the 'Oil of exorcism' and says 'Let every unclean spirit depart from thee.' This exorcism with oil in this period seems to be peculiarly Roman. An exorcism is found in Africa, but only by imposition of the hand, without oil[3]. On the other hand, the unction is used in Syria, but apparently with another signification; of which more hereafter[4]. (3) The presbyter delivers the catechumen to the bishop or to another presbyter standing at the font: a deacon descends with him into the tank, and there, prompted by the deacon, the candidate makes his confession[5], a summary of the faith in which he has been catechized, in some such words as these: 'I believe in God the Father almighty and in Christ Jesus

[1] Perhaps 'service' of the oriental versions translates *πομπῇ*.

[2] Tert. *de Idol.* 6, *de Spect.* 4, 24, *de Cor. Mil.* 3, 13, *de Cult. Fem.* i 2, *de Anima* 35: S. Cyp. *ad Fortunatum* 7, *de Dom. Or.* 19, *de Lapsis* 8, *de Hab. Virg.* 7: Origen *hom.* xii *in Num.* 4, *hom.* ii *in Ps. xxxviii* 5. See also Clem. Al. *Paed.* i 6 § 32: Origen *hom.* viii *in Exod.* 4, *ad Mart.* 17: *de Aleatoribus* 9: *Acta mart. Scillitan.* 3.

[3] *Sentt. epp.* 37: cp. 8, 31.

[4] *Didascalia* iii 12: *Clem. Recogn.* iii 67. See below p. 350. In Syria the unction was, in the case of women, administered by deaconesses (*Didasc.* loc. cit.).

[5] *'Ομολογία* S. Dion. Al. ap. Eus. *H.E.* vii 8: Origen *hom.* viii *in Exod.* 4, 5: Conc. Neocaes. *can.* 6.

his Son and in the Holy Ghost and the holy Church and the resurrection of the flesh'[1] adding, 'So I believe.'

The act of baptism follows. The bishop or the presbyter, standing beside the font, lays his hand on the head of the catechumen and puts to him 'the questions' to which he returns 'the answers.'[2] 'Dost thou believe in God the Father almighty?' He answers 'I believe'[3] and the minister baptizes him once. 'Dost thou believe in Christ Jesus the Son of God, who was born of the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary and crucified under Pontius Pilate and died and was buried and rose again the third day alive from the dead and ascended into heaven and sat down at the right hand of the Father, to come to judge the quick and the dead?' The catechumen answers 'I believe,' and the minister baptizes him a second time; and continues 'Dost thou believe in the Holy Ghost and the holy Church and the resurrection of the flesh?'[4] He answers again 'I believe,' and the minister baptizes him a third time.

[1] This confession has evidently been expanded and interpolated in the oriental versions. Here only so much of their text is quoted as recurs in the Creed below. A formula clearly descended from this is still used in the Coptic and Abyssinian Orders of Baptism (Denzinger *Rit. orient.* i pp. 198, 223): an intermediate form of the text is found in the Dêr-Balyzeh papyrus (*Revue Bénédictine* xxvi, Jan. 1909, p. 42).

[2] Origen *hom.* v *in Num.* 1 interrogationes ac responsiones: S. Dion. Al. ap. Eus. *H. E.* vii 9 τῶν ἐπερωτήσεων καὶ τῶν ἀποκρίσεων. Cp. Tert. *ad Mart.* 3, *de Cor. Mil.* 3, *de Pudicit.* 9: S. Cyp. *Epp.* lxix 7, lxx 2, lxxv 10 sq. (S. Firmilian): *de Rebaptismate* 10.

[3] From this point onward we have the Latin version of the *Order*.

[4] This text of the Creed differs from the 4th cent. text of the Roman Creed cited above (p. 334) in the following points, besides the addition of some conjunctions. (1) 'the Son of God' in place of 'his only Son our Lord.' This is supported as the reading of the Roman Creed in the first three quarters of the 3rd cent. by the formula so persistent in documents of that period, Roman or relating to Rome, 'God the Father and Christ Jesus the Son of God' or 'his Son': Tert. *Praesc.* 36, Hippol. *c. Noet.* 8, Novatian *de Trin.* 1, 9, Dionys. Rom. in Athan. *de Decret.* 26. (2) 'of' (*ex*) for 'and' before 'the Virgin.' So Tert. *Praesc.* 23, 36, *de Virg. Vel.* 1. (3) 'died' added. So Tert. *de carne Christi* 5, *adu. Prax.* 2: S. Justin M. *Ap.* i 21, 31, 42, 46, *Tryph.* 63, 85: cp. Hippol. *c. Noet.* 1. (4) 'the third

So baptized the neophyte ascends from the font and the presbyter anoints him with the Oil of thanksgiving, saying, 'I anoint thee with holy oil in the name of Jesus Christ.' And the neophyte dries himself and resumes his clothes.

There are some points in the last two paragraphs which call for remark. First, it will be noted that there is no 'baptismal formula,' or rather that the Creed itself is the formula: the subject is baptized three times, once after each paragraph of the Creed. This continued to be for centuries the Roman usage; and in later times there is no trace of it elsewhere except as the result of Roman influence[1]. In the ante-Nicene period the evidence is not explicit enough to make it possible to say what the usage was outside of the Roman sphere. The 8th canon of the Council of Arles, at which Italy, Sicily, Africa and the Gauls were represented, is perhaps framed and worded as it is in view of a use like the Roman. It directs that a heretic seeking reconciliation is to be asked, not with what 'form' he was baptized, but what creed he professed at his baptism, and, if it is found 'that he was baptized in the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost,'[2] he is to be reconciled by confirmation alone; whereas if his answer does not imply 'this Trinity' he is to be baptized. But on the other hand such phrases as Tertullian's 'inter pauca verba tinctus,'

day' differently placed. (5) 'alive' added. This reappears in the Creed of Niceta (*de Symb.* 6) and in later Spanish creeds. (6) 'sat' for 'sits,' as occasionally in later Latin and Greek forms. (7) 'to come' (*uenturus*) for 'whence he is to come' (*unde uenturus est*). So Tert. *Praesc.* 13, *de Virg. Vel.* 1, *adu. Prax.* 2. (8) 'the forgiveness of sins' omitted. There is no evidence for this clause in any Creed before the middle of the 3rd cent., when the African interrogative Creed had 'Credis in remissionem peccatorum et uitam aeternam per sanctam Ecclesiam?' (S. Cyp. *Epp.* lxix 7, lxx 2). The Hippolytean formula suggests the need of some revision of the ordinary account of the developement of the Roman Creed.

1 [Amb.] *de Sacramentis* ii 20: *Gelasian Sacramentary* I xliv, lxxv.

2 Cp. Tert. *adu. Prax.* 26 mandans ut tinguerent in Patrem et Filium et Spiritum sanctum, *Praesc.* 20: S. Cyp. *Ep.* lxxiii 18 quando ipse Christus gentes baptizari iubeat in plena et adunata Trinitate.

'ad singula nomina in personas singulas tinguimur'[1]; the reference to the form as an 'invocation' of the Name[2]; and Gnostic parallels[3]; all these seem rather to point to a 'baptismal formula,' as commonly understood. But however it was expressed, everywhere within the Church, and no doubt largely in the sects outside of it, baptism was conferred 'in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.'[4] It is true that the Pope, S. Stephen, like his successor six centuries later[5], was willing to accept as valid baptisms conferred 'in the Name of Jesus Christ, wherever and howsoever' conferred; but what he had in view was not any baptisms conferred within the Church, but those of some sect of heretics[6].

[1] Tert. *de Bapt.* 2, *adu. Prax.* 26. Cp. S. Justin M. *Apol.* i 61 *ἐν τῷ ὕδατι ἐπονομάζεται...τὸ τοῦ Πατρὸς...ὄνομα, αἰτὸ τοῦτο μόνον ἐπιλέγοντος τοῦ τὸν λουσόμενον ἄγοντος ἐπὶ τὸ λουτρόν...καὶ ἐπ' ὀνόματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ...καὶ ἐπ' ὀνόματος Πνεύματος ἁγίου.* When Tertullian says (*de Bapt.* 13) that S. Mat. xxviii 19 supplies a 'forma praescripta' of baptizing, it cannot be taken for granted that he means a 'prescribed formula.' Cp. *de Pudicit.* 6.

[2] Origen *in Ioan.* vi 17: S. Cyp. *Ep.* lxxv 9 (Firmilian): *de Rebaptismate* 5, 7: *Didascalia* iii 12 § 3: *Clem. Recogn.* iii 67.

[3] E.g. S. Iren. *Haer.* i 21 § 3 (of the Marcosians) *βαπτίζοντες οὕτως ἐπιλέγουσιν Εἰς ὄνομα ἀγνώστου πατρὸς* κτλ.

[4] Besides references in the preceding notes see *Didache* 7: S. Justin M. *Apol.* i 61: S. Iren. *Epideixis* 3: Origen *in Rom.* v 8: S. Cyp. *Epp.* lxxiii 5, lxxv (Firmilian) 9, 11: *de Rebaptismate* 7.

[5] Nicolas I *Respons. ad Bulgaros* 104.

[6] On the Baptismal Controversy of 255—256, see above, pp. 155 sqq. S. Stephen's formula was 'in nomine Iesu Christi ubicumque et quomodocumque baptizati gratiam baptismi sunt consecuti' (S. Cyp. *Ep.* lxxiii 16, 18, lxxv 18). It is clear that the author of *de Rebaptismate*, S. Cyprian, and S. Firmilian, all understood that Stephen accepted baptisms conferred simply 'in the Name of Jesus Christ,' i.e. not in the Threefold Name: *de Rebapt.* 5 sqq. (the Roman Church must not be held responsible for the particular arguments of the author), S. Cyp. *Epp.* lxxiii 16—18, lxxiv 5, lxxv 18. Dr Benson's argument (*Cyprian*, p. 407) to the effect that 'in nomine Iesu Christi baptizati' means 'baptized with Christian baptism,' by which Stephen left it to be understood that the baptism was conferred in the Threefold Name, is unsatisfactory. It turns on two passages in Firmilian's letter, Cyp. *Ep.* lxxv 9, 11. But in the latter passage Firmilian, by way of a *reductio ad absurdum*, challenges Stephen to accept the baptisms conferred by a possessed Cappadocian prophetess, and

Secondly, it will be noticed that the method of baptism is undefined. It is directed that, while the catechumen stands in the water, the minister standing at the font is to 'baptize' him; but whether by submerging him or by other means it is assumed that the reader will understand. Baptism is a bath, 'the laver of regeneration'; and the words descriptive of a bath—*mergere*, *tinguere*, *perfundere*, *lauare*, *abluere*—are used of it. But in the ancient world, as now, baths were of two kinds, the plunge-bath in which the whole body was submerged, and the shower-bath in which water was poured over the head and flowed down over the body or the bather stood under a jet of water. Consequently baptism has been conferred by both methods: the catechumen standing in the water, the minister in the act of baptism has, in the one usage, plunged him, and, in the other, poured water over his head or placed him under a jet[1]. Which of these methods was normal in the

he adds '*maxime* cui nec symbolum Trinitatis nec interrogatio legitima et ecclesiastica defuit,' where the 'especially' (which Dr Benson does not notice) would have no meaning unless in fact Stephen was willing to dispense with the Trinitarian formula. The former passage, in the absence of the full text of Stephen's letter, which we do not possess, is not quite lucid; but Firmilian seems to be dealing with two points in the Roman contention: first, that if baptism is conferred in the Threefold Name, it is sufficient and it is not necessary to enquire into the personal belief of the administrator; and secondly, 'sed dicunt eum qui *quomodocumque* foris baptizatus' received the grace of baptism, and the following context, especially when seen in the light of chapters 11 and 18, suggests that 'howsoever' covers baptism conferred 'in Nomine Iesu Christi.' (At the same time, it is perhaps worth while to note that one accustomed to the Roman rite, in which no formula 'In Nomine' was used, could more easily than others use the phrase 'in nomine Iesu Christi baptizari' in the sense of 'to receive Christian baptism,' and with less risk of being misunderstood.) The sect which Stephen had particularly in view was perhaps that of the Marcionites (cp. Cyp. *Ep.* lxxiii 4 sq.). I do not know to whom Dr Benson refers when he says (p. 405) 'There seem to have been in Africa some who understood baptism "in the Name of Christ" to be sufficient without the Trinal Invocation,' unless it be the author of *de Rebaptismate*, whom in fact he regards as an African.

[1] See C. F. Rogers 'Baptism and Christian archaeology' in *Studia Biblica* v 4 pp. 271 sq.: Duchesne *Origines du culte chrétien* p. 302, *Églises séparées* pp. 89 sqq.

ante-Nicene Church, it is perhaps impossible to ascertain. The *Didache* recognizes both, the quantity of water available determining which was used[1]. Of the words used to describe Baptism, *mergere* suggests the first method, *tinguere perfundere*[2] rather suggest the second. If it was possible to raise a doubt as to whether clinical baptism could be held to be sufficient, since in it there could be no question of bathing the subject and only affusion on the head was possible[3], yet this was an extreme case, a doubt about which could not equally affect the 'perfusion' of the whole body by water poured from above; while the doubt itself was quite exceptional and there was no real question as to the sufficiency of clinical baptism as baptism, whatever disabilities attached to it[4]. If in all pictorial representations, early or late—and some of them belong to the 2nd and 3rd centuries—whether of our Lord's Baptism or of that of Christian people, the Baptist or the minister pours water over the head of the subject standing in the water; yet this is not decisive in view of the difficulty of representing submersion without grotesque effect[5].

Thirdly, the catechumen is baptized thrice, once after each paragraph of the Creed or at each Name. This 'trine immersion' is found in contemporary Africa,

[1] *Didache* 7.

[2] S. Cyprian uses *perfundere* even of the affusion of the head in clinical baptism, *Ep.* lxix 12, 16. Cp. S. Cornelius's *περιχυθείς* in the same sense, Eus. *H. E.* vi 43 §§ 14, 17.

[3] S. Cyp. *Ep.* lxix 12 sqq.

[4] *de Rebaptism.* 4 sq.: Eus. *H. E.* vi 43 § 14. A clinically-baptized person might not be ordained: Cornelius ap. Eus. *H. E.* vi 43 § 17 *ἐπεὶ μὴ ἔξον ἦν τὸν ἐπὶ κλίνῃ διὰ νόσον περιχυθέντα...εἰς κληρόν τινα γενέσθαι*: Conc. Neocaes. *can.* 12 *ἐὰν νοσῶν τις φωτισθῇ εἰς πρεσβυτέριον ἄγεσθαι οὐ δύναται (οὐκ ἐκ προαιρέσεως γὰρ ἡ πίστις αὐτοῦ ἀλλ' ἐξ ἀνάγκης), εἰ μὴ τάχα διὰ τὴν μετὰ ταῦτα αὐτοῦ σπουδὴν καὶ πίστιν καὶ διὰ σπάνιν ἀνθρώπων.*

[5] See Cabrol *Dict. d'archéol. chrétienne et de liturgie* ii 1 *s.v.* 'Baptême de Jésus': Rogers *op. cit.* pp. 241 sqq. (and pp. 316 sqq., where the measurements of ancient fonts, some of them of the 3rd and 4th cents., are examined, and the difficulty or impossibility of submersion in them is pointed out).

and is ordered in the *Didache*[1]. These witnesses, combined with the fact that it was in use all over the Church in the 4th century, suggest that it was of very early institution and already widespread, if not universal, in the 2nd and 3rd centuries.

Lastly, the unction immediately following the baptism appears also in Africa. It is interpreted as symbolizing and imparting a share in the sacerdotal unction of the Anointed: washed in baptism, the baptized like Him is made 'God's anointed.'[2]

To resume the description of the rite. All now return to the church, where the bishop administers Confirmation. Laying his hand on each of the neophytes he prays 'Lord God, which hast accounted them worthy to receive remission of sins by the bath of regeneration of the Holy Ghost, send upon them thy grace that they may serve thee according to thy will: for to thee, the Father and the Son with the Holy Ghost, belongs the glory in the holy Church both now and world without end. Amen.' Then pouring the consecrated oil from his hand on to the head of each and imposing his hand, he says, 'I anoint thee with the holy oil in the Lord the Father almighty and Christ Jesus and the Holy Ghost,' and signing him on the brow with the sign of the cross he kisses him and says 'The Lord be with thee' and the neophyte answers 'And with thy spirit.'

This sequence, imposition of the hand, unction, consignation, is distinctively Roman. In Africa certainly, and probably everywhere else in the West, the unction was wanting. But as well in Rome as elsewhere the imposition of the hand and its accompanying prayer were the essential 'matter' and 'form' of Con-

1 *Didache* 7: Tert. *de Cor. Mil.* 3, *adu. Prax.* 26.

2 Tert. *de Bapt.* 7, *de Resur. carnis* 8, *adu. Marcion.* i 14 (from which it appears that the unction was used by the Marcionites): S. Cyp. *Ep.* lxx 2.

firmation[1]; the unction and the consignation being adjuncts making explicit the character of Confirmation as the 'unction' and the 'seal' of the Holy Ghost[2]. In the East, on the other hand, unction was the prominent 'matter' and was already, as it were, absorbing the imposition of the hand; so that Origen at Caesarea, like the Easterns of the next century, mentions only the unction as the sequel of baptism[3]. Another usage also appears alongside of this in other parts of Syria, a usage perpetuated among the Nestorians till the 7th century, which emphasized the pre-baptismal unction and apparently transformed what was elsewhere an exorcism into the unction of Confirmation; so that Confirmation preceded baptism and the

[1] Tert. *de Bapt.* 8 dehinc manus imponitur per benedictionem aduocans et inuitans Spiritum sanctum, *de Resur. carn.* 8: S. Cyp. *Ep.* lxxiii 9 quod nunc quoque apud nos geritur ut qui in Ecclesia baptizantur praepositis Ecclesiae offerantur et per nostram orationem ac manus impositionem Spiritum sanctum consequantur et signaculo dominico consummentur, and *Epp.* lxx—lxxiv *passim*, where the imparting of the Gift of the Holy Ghost is always attached to the imposition of the hand, and the imposition by which Stephen reconciled the heretically-baptized is always assumed to be confirmation. With this the author of *de Rebaptismate* (1, 4, 6, 10) agrees. See also *de Aleatoribus* 3: Conc. Elib. *can.* 38, 77: Conc. Arelat. i *can.* 8. Cp. P. Galtier S. J. 'La consignation à Carthage et à Rome' in *Recherches de science religieuse* 4 (1911) pp. 350 sqq.

[2] Cp. 2 Cor. i 21 *ὁ δὲ βεβαιῶν ἡμᾶς σὺν ὑμῖν εἰς Χριστὸν καὶ χρίσας ἡμᾶς Θεὸς καὶ σφραγισάμενος ἡμᾶς καὶ δοὺς τὸν ἀρραβῶνα τοῦ Πνεύματος ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν*: which may have suggested the sequence of ceremonies. For the sign of the cross see Tert. *de Resur. carn.* 8, *Praesc.* 40, *adu. Marcion.* iii 22, *de Idol.* 19, *de Cor. Mil.* 11: S. Hippol. *in Dan.* iv 9: Origen *Selecta in Ezech. ix 4*: S. Cyp. *ad Demetr.* 22, *de Unitate* 18, *Epp.* lviii 9, lxxiii 9: Pontius *Vita Cyp.* 7. S. Cornelius describes confirmation by *σφραγισθῆναι* (Eus. *H. E.* vi 43 § 15).

[3] Origen *in Rom.* v 8 quamuis secundum typum ecclesiis traditum omnes baptizati sumus in aquis istis uisibilibus et in chrismate uisibili: cp. *hom. in Lev.* vi 5, ix 9, *Selecta in Ezech. xvi 9.* In *de Princip.* i 3 §§ 2, 7 Origen notices that the apostles imparted the Holy Ghost 'in baptismo' or 'post baptismum' *by imposition of hands.* Hence, either the act of applying the oil was regarded as a sufficient imposition of the hand, or else the oil, itself consecrated by imposition of the hand, virtually conveyed it to the subject anointed. The same 'absorption' happened some centuries later in the West.

neophyte passed immediately from baptism to communion[1].

The baptismal rite, as we have seen, followed the Mass of the Catechumens. The Liturgy is now resumed, and the newly-initiated, who as catechumens had hitherto been dismissed after the sermon, now for the first time take their part in 'the Common Prayers' with which the Mass of the Faithful opens[2], and in the exchange of the Kiss of Peace which follows[3]. At the Offertory, with the rest of the faithful, they offer their oblations of bread, which they had been instructed to bring with them[4]. Besides the bread and the mixture of wine and water[5], which the deacons bring to the bishop for the Eucharist, there are offered also a cup of water and another of mingled milk and honey. The bishop, laying his hands, with the presbyters, on the oblation, says 'The Lord be with you,' 'Lift up your hearts' and the rest, and all respond; and the bishop proceeds to recite the great Thanksgiving[6], with which

[1] For this see Connolly *Liturgical homilies of Narsai* pp. xlii sqq.: T. Thompson *The offices of baptism and confirmation* pp. 11 sqq., 66 sqq. *Didascalia* iii 12 seems to describe the same use, the prebaptismal unction being accompanied by the imposition of the bishop's hand: but on the other hand iii 33 (agnosce episcopos tuos per quos es filius Dei, et dexteram matrem tuam...episcopos...qui per aquam uos regenerauerunt, qui Spiritu sancto uos repleuerunt) seems to imply that confirmation by imposition of the hand followed baptism.

[2] Cp. S. Justin M. *Apol.* i 65, 67: Origen *in Mat. com. ser.* 89, *c. Cels.* iv 27: Tert. *de Bapt.* 20 igitur, benedicti [catechumeni], ...cum de illo sanctissimo lauacro noui natalis ascenditis et primas manus apud matrem cum fratribus aperitis, petite de Patre...tantum oro ut cum petitis etiam Tertulliani peccatoris memineritis.

[3] Cp. S. Justin M. *Apol.* i 65.

[4] *Order* 15 § 11. Cp. S. Cyp. *de Op. et Eleemos.* 15.

[5] The water in the chalice is not mentioned in the *Order*, but see S. Justin M. *Apol.* i 65, 67: S. Iren. *Haer.* iv 33 § 2, v 1 § 3, 2 § 2: Clem. Al. *Strom.* i 19 § 96: S. Cyp. *Ep.* lxiii.

[6] The Eucharistia is given in *Order* 1: but of course the bishop was not bound to this form, but might compose his own prayer on the same lines (4 secundum ea quae supra diximus: attamen non necesse est eadem uerba eum proferre quae supra diximus: cp. S. Justin M. *Apol.* i 67 ὅση δύναμις αὐτῷ).

the Eucharist, and the chalices of water and of milk and honey, are consecrated. This finished the bishop breaks the consecrated Bread, and communicates each of the neophytes, saying 'The heavenly Bread in Christ Jesus,' and the communicant answers 'Amen.'[1] The presbyters or the deacons follow with the three chalices and administer successively the water, to be received as a symbol of the inward effect of the bodily washing of baptism; the milk and honey, as a symbol of the Promised Land which the neophyte has entered after crossing the Jordan of Baptism[2]; and the consecrated Wine; each with the curious formula 'In God the Father almighty,' to which the neophyte answers 'Amen,' 'And the Lord Jesus Christ and the Holy Ghost and the holy Church,' to which again the neophyte replies 'Amen.'

v. Hitherto we have been concerned with catechumens old enough to receive instruction and to answer for themselves. But the Hippolytean *Order* contemplates also the baptism of infants[3]. For the period before the last quarter of the 2nd century, it is a matter of reasonable inference rather than of explicit evidence that infants were baptized; but from S. Irenaeus onwards the evidence is clear[4]. It is true that Tertullian is critical and would have baptism delayed until the subject can be taught what it means and can consciously seek it; he would even postpone it till after marriage, in view of the pressure of temptation[5]. But it is the usage of the Church which he is criticizing; and

[1] For this *Amen* see Tert. *de Spect.* 25 (Africa), Eus. *H. E.* vi 43 § 19 (Rome).

[2] Cp. Origen *hom.* iv *in Ies. Nav.* 1. The Milk and Honey was used also in Egypt (Clem. Al. *Paed.* i 6 § 45) and in Africa (Tert. *de Cor. Mil.* 3, *adu. Marcion.* i 14).

[3] *Order* 16 § 4.

[4] S. Iren. *Haer.* ii 22 § 4: Origen *in Rom.* v 6, *hom.* viii *in Lev.* 3, xiv *in Luc.*: S. Cyp. *de Lapsis* 9, 25.

[5] Tert. *de Bapt.* 18.

fifty years later S. Cyprian and his colleagues in Council had occasion to deprecate the desire of some people to delay the baptism of children even for so long as till the eighth day from their birth[1]. Infants, therefore, except those which were born shortly before Easter —and for those the *Order* provides that they are to be baptized first, before the adult catechumens[2]— were baptized at any time without regard to the Paschal season. Since they were unable to speak for themselves, their sponsors made their renunciation and confession of faith and answered the interrogations. The sponsor, according to the *Order*, was normally, as long continued to be the case[3], a parent or some relation of the child; and the sponsor was understood to be responsible for its Christian instruction and discipline[4]. Infant baptisms, as well as those of the sick, were often or generally administered by presbyters or deacons or others, in remote places far from the bishop. Consequently Confirmation was postponed until the subject could be brought to the bishop to be confirmed[5].

II

After initiation by Baptism, the new Christian has already inaugurated his new life and exercised his chiefest right and privilege by participating in the oblation and the communion of the Eucharist, at once the sustenance and the sign of his spiritual fellowship[6]. Henceforth it is not only his duty, but also his right, to offer and to communicate Sunday by Sunday[7]. In

[1] S. Cyp. *Ep.* lxiv 2 sqq.
[2] *Order* 16 § 4.
[3] Bingham *Antiquities* XI viii 2.
[4] Tert. *de Bapt.* 18.
[5] *de Rebaptismate* 4 sq.
[6] Cp. S. Cyp. *de Dom. Or.* 18.
[7] Pliny *Ep.* x 96: S. Justin M. *Apol.* i 67: *Didascalia* ii 59: Conc. Elib. *can.* 21. Children were communicated from the time of their baptism onwards: S. Cyp. *de Lapsis* 25.

some churches he may also, if he will, communicate daily at home in the species of Bread which he has carried away in his *arca* from the Sunday Liturgy[1]. If he travels, on shewing evidence, whether by letters of communion[2] or otherwise, that he is in the communion of the Church, he is given his due place in the congregation and communicates in the church where he finds himself[3]. He has his voice in the election of his bishop and of those whom his bishop is to ordain as deacons or presbyters[4]. If he marries, the Church intervenes to confirm his betrothal and to consecrate his marriage by the oblation of the Eucharist and benediction[5]. Widows and those in distress are supported by a share in the oblations[6]; and from time to time they are entertained at a Lord's Supper or *Agape* in the houses of their richer brethren[7]. The sick are visited by the deacons or deaconesses and reported to the bishop, who, if he thinks fit, himself in turn visits them[8]; and they are communicated either from the altar after the public Liturgy[9], or with the reserved sacrament[10], and especially they receive their *viaticum* at the last[11]. The body of the dead is prepared for burial with the prayers

[1] Tert. *de Orat.* 19, *ad Uxor.* ii 5: S. Hippol. *Order* 29: S. Cyp. *de Lapsis* 26, *de Dom. Or.* 18: Novatian *de Spect.* 5: *Mart. S. Pionii* 3. Perhaps the species of Wine was also reserved and carried home: see Connolly *The so-called Egyptian Church Order* p. 81.

[2] 'Litterae communicatoriae': Conc. Elib. *can.* 25, Arelat. i *can.* 7, 9. Cp. Eus. *H.E.* v 4 § 2, vi 11 § 6.

[3] *Didascalia* ii 58 § 1.

[4] S. Clem. Rom. *ad Cor.* 44 § 3: S. Hippol. *Order* 1, 3: Eus. *H. E.* vi 29 §§ 3 sq., 43 § 17: S. Cyp. *Epp.* lv 8, lix 5, lxvii 3 sqq., lxviii 2.

[5] Tert. *ad Uxor.* ii 9 unde sufficiamus ad enarrandam felicitatem eius matrimonii quod Ecclesia conciliat et confirmat oblatio et obsignat benedictio?

[6] Eus. *H.E.* vi 43 § 11 *χήρας σὺν θλιβομένοις*: S. Cyp. *Ep.* viii (from the Roman clergy) 3 siue uiduae siue thlibomeni: *Didasc.* ii 25 § 2, 27 § 4.

[7] Hippol. *Order* 18—22: *Didasc.* ii 28.

[8] Hippol. *Order* 26: *Didasc.* iii 12 sq. [9] S. Justin M. *Apol.* i 65, 67.

[10] S. Dion. Al. ap. Eus. *H.E.* vi 44 § 4: implying, for Egypt, that the Eucharist was habitually reserved.

[11] Conc. Nicaen. *can.* 13 *τοῦ τελευταίου καὶ ἀναγκαιοτάτου ἐφοδίου.*

of the Church[1], and laid in the Christian cemetery[2], and he is commemorated at the Eucharist offered for his repose[3].

But the continued possession and enjoyment of these privileges was conditional; they might be forfeited. By the right by which the churchman held them, by the same right he was subject to the discipline of the Church, and by the exercise of that discipline he could be deprived of them if he failed to fulfil the conditions implied and accepted in his initiation. We have now to note (i) the character of this discipline, (ii) the conditions under which it was applied, and (iii) the manner of its exercise. For this purpose unfortunately we have no longer any connected and detailed account of things to guide us, and we must be content to collect and arrange some of the scattered allusions to be found in the writers of the period.

i. 'We gather together in an assembly and congregation, in order, forming ourselves as it were into a body, to solicit God with prayers...and there also are administered exhortations, reproofs, and a divine censorship. For there judgement is exercised with a great weight of authority where men are assured that they are in God's sight: and it is a supreme anticipation of the judgement to come, if any have so offended as to be exiled from the fellowship of prayer and assembly and all holy intercourse.'[4] Or again: 'With regard to [our] procedure with respect to those who sin, and in particular to the licentious, [we] who, according to Celsus, are like "the people who make infamous exhibitions in the public square," expel them from [our]

[1] Tert. *de Anima* 51 cum in pace dormisset et morante sepultura interim oratione presbyteri componeretur.

[2] Tert. *ad Scap.* 3: S. Hippol. *Order* 31, *Philosoph.* ix 12: *Acta procons. S. Cyp.* 1: *Didasc.* vi 22 § 2: Eus. *H.E.* vii 11 § 10, 13 § 3, ix 2 § 1.

[3] Tert. *de Cor. Mil.* 3, *de Monog.* 10, *de Exhort. Cast.* 11: S. Cyp. *Epp.* i 2, xxxix 3: *Didasc.* vi 22 § 2.

[4] Tert. *Apol.* 39.

fellowship. The solemn school of the Pythagoreans used to set up cenotaphs to those who fell away from their philosophy, accounting that they had died: and so these Christians mourn for them that have been overcome by licentiousness or any enormity as having perished and died unto God.'[1] These are two descriptions of the Christian discipline, one Western, the other Eastern, addressed to those without and in general terms[2]. But Origen is interested frequently to expound in some detail the character and principles of the discipline in addressing those within; and from his exposition we can derive a sufficient account of the matter.

According to Origen[3], then, (1) the Church is concerned to guard its own purity; and to this end its members in common ought to observe the lives of their fellows. But (2) it is more especially the duty of the ministers of the Church to be watchful, and most of all that of the bishop, both because he is the head and the eye of the body, the shepherd of the flock[4], and because he has the authority to 'bind' and to 'retain.'[5] (3) Bishops fail of their duty if, on the one hand, they spare the guilty through regard to their own interest, and, on the other, if they are too ready to excommunicate and if they visit trifling offences too severely[6]. Origen of course recognizes the necessary limitations imposed by human infirmity and fallibility: there are those externally in the communion of the Church who are spiritually cut off, and those externally cut off who are spiritually still in communion[7].

[1] Origen *c. Cels.* iii 51.

[2] Cp. Tert. *Apol.* 46: S. Hippol. *in Dan.* i 17: S. Cyp. *de Dominica Oratione* 18: *de Aleatoribus* 4.

[3] This paragraph mainly follows *hom.* vii *in Ies. Nav.* 6, *hom.* ii *in Iudic.* 5. The following references are to sources for additional points and illustrations.

[4] Cp. *hom.* i *in Ps. xxxvii* 1: *Didasc.* ii 37.

[5] *in Mat.* xii 14, *de Orat.* 28.

[6] Cp. *in Mat.* xvi 8: *Didasc.* ii 9, 17.

[7] *hom.* xiv *in Lev.* 2 sq., *selecta in Ier. xxix 4.* Cp. S. Cyp. *Ep.* lv 18.

(4) The discipline of the Church is applicable (*a*) only to grave offences[1]; (*b*) only to open and manifest offences[2]: that is to say, it is only in the case of manifest sins that the Church can take the initiative; with secret sins God himself deals, and all that the Church can do is through its ministers to admonish and exhort the faithful and catechumens alike, that, if any are conscious of grievous sins, they repent, and, if the sins are such as notoriously to require public penance or *exomologesis*, they voluntarily confess and submit themselves to it[3], or, if there be any doubt, they make a private confession and receive direction as to whether *exomologesis* is required or not[4]. (5) The extreme penalty of excommunication is only to be resorted to after repeated admonition and reproof. (6) The excommunication pronounced by the bishop is the act of 'the whole Church according in one consent.' (7) The purpose of the discipline is at once to protect the Church from defilement and scandal, and to secure the repentance, amendment, and salvation of the offender. And lastly (8) the exercise of this discipline is the application, in accordance with the apostolic precedent (1 Cor. v 3—5), of the evangelic precept touching the means to be taken with a brother who offends (S. Mat. xviii 15—17)[5], of 'the power of the keys' (*ib.* xvi 19, xviii 18)[6], and of the apostolic directions (1 Cor. v 13, 1 Tim. v 20).

ii. What then were the 'grave sins' which incurred the extreme penalty of excommunication?

In the first three centuries there was no written

1 Cp. *hom.* xv *in Lev.* 2, *in Mat.* xiii 30.

2 Cp. *hom.* xxi *in Ies. Nav.* 1.

3 *hom.* xiv *in Lev.* 4, *hom.* xvii *in Luc.*

4 *hom.* ii *in Ps. xxxvii* 1, 2, 6. A private confession was of course made in either case (*hom.* ii *in Lev.* 4: cp. S. Cyp. *de Lapsis* 28). It is commonly assumed that a public confession was also made before the Church by those who submitted to *exomologesis*: but this is very questionable except in so far as to be under penance was itself an implicit confession.

5 Cp. *in Mat.* xiii 30: *Didasc.* ii 38.

6 *in Mat.* xii 14. Cp. *Didasc.* ii 11, 18, 34.

code to appeal to. The case was rather that there existed in the collective mind of the Church a *regula disciplinae*, a common law[1], which was formulated and applied as occasion arose; and we have to arrive at the content of the rule partly by consideration of the conditions of communion expressed or implied in the process of initiation, partly by noting the sins which are incidentally referred to either as especially grave, or explicitly as incurring excommunication, and partly by observing the administration of the discipline in recorded instances of its application. It is not till the opening of the 4th century and the great conciliar period that rules begin to be framed by legislation and the

[1] The life and administration of the Church is regulated by a *Canon* or *Rule* (*κανών*, *regula*), a general traditional custom or 'common law' (but very rarely described as 'law': *Sentt. epp.* 29 legis ecclesiasticae regula: Conc. Nic. *can.* 13 *ὁ παλαιὸς καὶ κανονικὸς νόμος* and *Letter* ap. Socr. *H.E.* i 9 *νόμος καὶ θεσμὸς ὁ ἐκκλησιαστικός*). This *Canon* includes three departments. (1) 'The Rule of Faith' or 'of Truth' (*ὁ κανὼν τῆς πίστεως* or *τῆς ἀληθείας*, *regula fidei*, *regula ueritatis*: S. Iren. *Haer.* i 9 § 4, Tert. *Praesc.* 13, Novatian *de Trin.* 1, *Ep. Pet. ad Iac.* 3, &c.) prescribing the essential faith of the Church. (2) 'The Rule of the Church' (*ὁ κανὼν τῆς ἐκκλησίας*, *ὁ κανὼν ὁ ἐκκλησιαστικός*, *ecclesiastica regula*), regulating the disciplinary administration (e.g. the conditions of ordination, Nic. *can.* 2, 6, 9, 10, and of reconciliation, *Ep. Clem. ad Iac.* 2, Nic. *can.* 5, 13; the discipline of the clergy, *ib.* 15, 16, 18; restraint of accusations, Conc. Arelat. i *can.* 13) and liturgical procedure (the worship of the Church generally, Origen *in Ioan.* xiii 16; the use of the interrogations in Baptism, S. Firmil. ap. Cyp. *Ep.* lxxv 10, and of Confirmation following Baptism, Cornelius ap. Eus. *H.E.* vi 43 § 15; of the mixed chalice, Clem. Al. *Strom.* i 19 § 96, and the Invocation, S. Firmil. *u.s.*, in the Eucharist: cp. Tertullian's obseruatio inueterata, consuetudo, *de Cor. Mil.* 3). (3) 'The Rule of Discipline' (*regula disciplinae*, Tert. *Apol.* 46, *de Pudicit.* 19), regulating the personal moral life and conduct of Christians. (4) The 'canonized' (*canonizati* Orig. *in Mat.* 28) or 'canonical' (*canonici* Orig. *de Princ.* iv 33; *regulares*, *in Mat.* 117) books belong to the second department of 'the Canon,' being so called probably as being prescribed by 'the Rule of the Church': cp. Eus. *H.E.* vi 25 § 3 *ἐν δὲ τῷ πρώτῳ τῶν Εἰς τὸ κατὰ Ματθαῖον* (of Origen), *τὸν ἐκκλησιαστικὸν φυλάττων κανόνα, μόνα τέσσαρα εἶναι Εὐαγγέλια μαρτύρεται*: but when, in the second half of the 4th cent., they come to be called collectively 'the Canon of the Scriptures' (*κανὼν τῶν γραφῶν* S. Amphiloch. *ad Seleuc.*), this may be considered to form a fourth department of 'the Canon.' Conciliar decrees (*ὅροι* Conc. Nic. *can.* 15, 17, 19 afterwards called *κανόνες*) are particular

foundations are laid of a Canon Law, which reduces the rule of discipline to writing. But the results are fairly coincident: the judgements of the earlier period and the enactments of the first quarter of the 4th century converge on a list of grave offences which are the subject-matter of the severe public discipline of the Church.

Baptism was admission into the holy Church, conferred on the conditions of renouncing paganism and of accepting and confessing the Faith of the Church. Consequently relapse into paganism, whether in the shape of apostasy under stress of persecution or by connivance at pagan worship, the corruption of the Faith, and revolt against the Church and the violation of its unity—in other words Idolatry, Heresy, and Schism—were incompatible with continuance in the Christian fellowship. And again, those pursuits which, unless renounced, excluded a candidate from admission to the catechumenate, were equally inconsistent with the status of the initiated; and, as we saw, the grounds on which these pursuits were disallowed were that in one degree or another they involved Idolatry or Magic or Homicide or Uncleanness[1].

Tertullian cites two lists of sins which were regarded as *grauiora et exitiosa*, *mortalia*, or *capitalia*; and these lists combined contain Apostasy, Idolatry and Blasphemy; Homicide; Adultery and Fornication; Fraud; and False-witness[2]. S. Cyprian has no formal catalogue of

applications or enforcements of 'the Canon' (see Nicene canons *passim*). It goes without saying that the contents of the *regula disciplinae* and the grounds of excommunication were largely determined by the Holy Scriptures: see Tert. *de Pudicitia* 1 censuram per iudicia ex utroque testamento, Origen *in Mat.* xii 14 τοῦ μὲν οὖν ἀδίκως κρίνοντος καὶ μὴ κατὰ λόγον Θεοῦ δεσμεύοντος ἐπὶ γῆς, μηδὲ κατὰ βούλησιν αὐτοῦ λύοντος ἐπὶ γῆς, πύλαι ᾅδου κατισχύουσιν.

1 If Magic be reckoned as a form of Idolatry (as it is in canon 6 of Eliberis) we have here the three principal *delicta capitalia* (see below, p. 375).

2 Tert. *de Pudicitia* 19, *adu. Marc.* iv 9. These lists are identical,

grave sins: but for him Idolatry is *grauissimum et extremum delictum*[1]; Schism is *inexpiabilis et grauis culpa*[2], and heretics and schismatics generally are 'adversaries of the Lord and antichrists' who 'must be reckoned among heathen men and publicans'[3]; while Adultery, Fraud, and Homicide are examples, 'a few from among many,' of 'mortal crimes.'[4] If we collect the classes of grave sins to which Origen refers in his discussions of penitence, whether private or public, we arrive at the list: Apostasy, Idolatry, Blasphemy of the Faith, i.e. Heresy, and Sorcery; Homicide; Adultery, Fornication, and Corruption of boys; Theft, Rapacity, and Violence; and False-witness[5]. And there is a notably close correspondence between these and the list of sins of word and deed—and sins of thought are naturally not the subject-matter of public discipline[6]—covered by the negative precepts of the section on the 'Way of Life' in the *Two Ways*; viz. Idolatry, Blasphemy, and Magic; Homicide, including abortion and infanticide; Adultery, Fornication and Corruption of boys; Theft, Greed, and Rapacity; False-witness and Perjury[7].

except that the second substitutes *falsum testimonium* for the *negatio* (i.e. apostasy: see *de Pudicit.* 9) of the first. 'Blasphemy' included apostasy by uttering reproaches against Christ at the bidding of the persecutor (Pliny *Ep.* x 96: S. Justin M. *Apol.* i 31: *Mart. S. Polycarpi* 9: Eus. *H.E.* vi 41 §§ 3, 7, 8: cp. Acts xxvi 11), and some sorts of heresy (S. Iren. *Haer.* iv praef. 2 sq.: S. Cyp. *Ep.* lxiii 18 sq.).

[1] S. Cyp. *Ep.* xv 1.

[2] S. Cyp. *de Unitate* 14: cp. S. Iren. *Haer.* iv 33 § 7, S. Dion. Al. ap. Eus. *H.E.* vi 45.

[3] S. Cyp. *Ep.* lxix 1.

[4] S. Cyp. *de Bono Patientiae* 14: cp. *de Dom. Or.* 24, *Epp.* lv 27, lix 14.

[5] Orig. *in Mat. com. ser.* 114, *de Orat.* 28, *hom.* xv *in Lev.* 2, *in Mat.* xiii 30, *hom.* vi *in Exod.* 9, *hom.* xi *in Lev.* 2, *hom.* i *in Ps. xxxvi* 5.

[6] Conc. Neocaes. *can.* 4 and Hefele's note *in loc.*; Bingham *Antiq.* xvi 17.

[7] *Didache* 2, 3. Cp. the list of sins which the Bithynian Christians bound themselves by oath not to commit: 'ne furta, ne latrocinia, ne adulteria committerent, ne fidem fallerent, ne depositum appellati abnegarent' (Pliny *Ep.* x 96). The interesting list, *Didasc.* iv 6, of those whose offerings ought to be rejected, refers perhaps, not to Christians, but to outsiders who for whatever reason wished to contribute to the funds of the Church.

It cannot be expected that any complete catalogue of the graver sins can be derived from recorded examples of the exercise of ecclesiastical discipline, since for the most part it is only instances of more than individual and local significance that have left a record of themselves. Consequently the greater number of these instances concern apostates, heretics, and schismatics. For example: the Apostasy of those who lapsed in the persecutions of Decius and Diocletian carried with it its own sentence: the *lapsi* were *ipso facto* out of communion[1]. Of Heretics, Cerdon, Marcion's master, was excommunicated more than once by the Roman Church under Hyginus[2]; the first Theodotus was 'banned from communion' by Victor[3]; Sabellius by Callistus[4]; S. Dionysius of Corinth takes it for granted that heretics are excommunicated[5]; Montanus and his prophetesses 'were cast out and excluded from communion' by the Asian Councils[6]; Noetus by the Church of Smyrna[7]; Paul of Samosata by the Antiochene Council (*c.* 269)[8]; and Arius by S. Alexander and the Alexandrine Council (*c.* 321)[9]. The Asian and some neighbouring dioceses, which observed the quartodeciman rule as to Easter, were 'utterly cut off,' as schismatical, from the communion of the Roman Church by Victor[10]; Felicissimus and his adherents were excommunicated by S. Cyprian[11], and Novatian was declared by the African Council in 251 to have excommunicated himself[12], and some months later he and his adherents

1 This is plain from all the circumstances.
2 S. Iren. *Haer.* iii 4 § 2: cp. Tert. *Praesc.* 30.
3 Eus. *H.E.* v 28 §§ 6, 9.
4 S. Hippol. *Philosoph.* ix 12.
5 Eus. *H.E.* iv 23 § 6: cp. *ibid.* vii 7 § 4.
6 *Ibid.* v 16 § 10.
7 S. Hippol. *c. Noetum* 1.
8 Eus. *H.E.* vii 30 § 17.
9 Socrates *H.E.* i 6.
10 Eus. *H.E.* v 24 § 9.
11 S. Cyp. *Epp.* xli 2, xlii, lix 1.
12 *Ibid.* lxviii 2 cum Nouatianus...ad nos in Africam legatos misisset optans ad communicationem nostram admitti, hinc a Concilio...sententiam retulerit se foris esse coepisse nec posse a quoquam nostri sibi communicari. For the Roman excommunication see Eus. *H.E.* vi 43 § 2.

were excommunicated by the Roman Church. As examples of other offenders: the heretic Marcion had been excommunicated by his father, the bishop of Sinope, for unchastity[1]; the Montanist adventurer Alexander had been excommunicated on being convicted, in a secular court, of robbery[2]; Novatus was charged with fraud and rapacity, cruelty and violence, and only escaped being put on his trial by the outburst of the Decian persecution[3]; and S. Gregory Thaumaturgus took measures for the excommunication of those who, during the Gothic invasion of Pontus in the middle of the 3rd century, had been guilty of theft or pillage, kidnapping or murder[4].

In the first quarter of the 4th century, Councils were assembled at Eliberis for the moral reformation of the Church of the Spanish peninsula; at Ancyra in Galatia and Neocaesarea in Pontus (314) for the settlement of the affairs of the Church of central and eastern Asia Minor after the great persecution; at Arles (314) and Nicaea (325) to deal the one with Donatism, the other with Arianism; and each of them enacted a series of disciplinary canons. These enactments formed the beginnings of a *Ius canonicum* in which the 'canon of the Church' was reduced to a written law, and the occasional decisions of local churches were replaced by rules valid over wide areas or over the Church at large. If these series of canons of the early 4th century are combined and classified, it is found that they treat approximately of the same classes of grave offences as we have already seen to be the subject-matter of the severe measures of ecclesiastical discipline. Accordingly they deal with Idolatry, whether direct, like the overt apostasy of the *lapsi* in the great Persecution or in that of Licinius, or indirect, like that involved in the public

[1] ps.-Tert. *Praesc.* 51.
[2] Eus. *H.E.* v 18 § 9.
[3] S. Cyp. *Ep.* lii 2, 3.
[4] S. Greg. Thaumat. *Ep. canonica.*

services or the Spectacles, or in marriage with the heathen ; Heresy and marriage with heretics ; Magic ; Homicide, whether wilful, including abortion and infanticide, or unintentional ; Uncleanness, viz. adultery, fornication, and worse, procuration, and marriage within the prohibited degrees[1] ; Fraud, represented by usury[2] ; Delation and False-witness.

The 'grave sins,' then, which formed the subject-matter of the discipline we are concerned with, may be summarised as belonging to the eight categories : Idolatry, Magic, Heresy, Schism, Homicide, Uncleanness, Fraud, False-witness.

iii. There is not much information available as to procedure in the application of the ecclesiastical discipline. What there is of it is mostly to be found in the *Didascalia apostolorum* describing in particular the usage of some part of Syria ; which, however, is so simple and obvious that usage elsewhere cannot have been markedly different.

In some cases there was no formal procedure at all. As we have seen, those who lapsed under persecution, and, in some instances, the makers of schisms, were *ipso facto* excommunicate : they had excommunicated themselves, and the schismatics in fact had excommunicated the Church. In these cases, all that was left for the Church to do was to define the terms on which they could be reconciled.

In other cases, if the offence was notorious or if it came to the knowledge of the bishop otherwise than by formal accusation, the bishop rebuked and admonished the offender in private. If it did not avail to bring him to acknowledgement and to willingness to make satisfaction, the rebuke and admonition were repeated before witnesses. If this again was ineffectual, the offender was

[1] Elib. 61 (deceased wife's sister), Neocaes. 2 (deceased husband's brother), Elib. 66 (step-daughter).

[2] Elib. 79 directs the excommunication of gamblers : cp. *de Aleatoribus* 4.

openly rebuked before the church. If this failed he was excommunicated[1].

When, on the other hand, it was a question of a formal and responsible accusation brought by one of the faithful against another—and no accusation on the part of a pagan was admitted[2]—a judicial process was instituted[3]. The bishop with his presbyters and deacons formed the court, and the accused was confronted with his accuser. The first step was to investigate the character of the accuser: in order to ascertain whether there were antecedent grounds for suspecting the sincerity and truth of the accusation, enquiry was made whether the accuser himself laboured under any accusation or had been guilty in the past of any grave offence; whether he had in the past brought charges against others; whether his accusation was occasioned by a standing enmity or by quarrelsomeness or envy; and finally whether his own manner of life was such as a Christian's ought to be. Next, a like investigation was made of the character and the manner of life of the accused, whether he had been the subject of other charges or had been guilty of other offences; with a view to discovering whether there was any antecedent likelihood of his being guilty on the present charge. After these preliminaries, the particular charge was investigated. If it was established, after consultation the offender was rebuked and sentence was passed upon him; otherwise he was acquitted, and the author of a deliberately false and malicious accusation was himself excommunicated[4]. In the *Didascalia* there is nothing to shew whether external witnesses were called, or whether the Court, besides interrogating the parties, examined only its own members, and especially the deacons, who, as

[1] *Didascalia* ii 37 sq.

[2] *Ibid.* 45 § 2.

[3] S. Cyp. *Epp.* lii 3, lix 15 uses *cognitio*, *iudicium*, of the process: *Didasc.* ii 47 τὰ δικαστήρια.

[4] *Didasc.* ii 47 sqq.

the visitors of the flock and the 'eye' and 'ear' of the bishop[1], had the opportunity and the duty of observation and enquiry beforehand; but in the *cognitiones* referred to by S. Cyprian, which examined the cases of the *lapsi*, it is clear that witnesses were called[2]. Nor does the *Didascalia* mention the laity as taking any part in the process, or even indicate their presence at the enquiry. But Origen at Caesarea is emphatic that the sentence of excommunication is the act of 'the whole Church according in one consent'[3]; and S. Cyprian's insistence on the presence of the Christian *plebs* and their cooperation in determining the conditions of the reconciliation of the *lapsi*[4], and his complaint of the pains and trouble it cost him to gain their consent to a merciful treatment of penitent schismatics[5], suggests that the laity formed a jury whose vote counted for much, and was in fact in the last resort decisive, in the whole disciplinary process.

III

The purpose of excommunication was, not only to preserve the soundness of the Church[6], but also if possible to secure the repentance and amendment of the offender, and, with some exceptions to be noted hereafter, his ultimate restoration to communion[7]. Consequently the sentence by which the offender was ejected, at the same time defined the terms on which he could be reconciled. But, since the Church wields only a 'spiritual sword'[8] and exercises no coercion, it rested with the

[1] S. Hippol. *Order* 26: *Didasc.* ii 44 §§ 3, 4, iii 13: *Ep. Clem. ad Iac.* 12.
[2] S. Cyp. *Ep.* lix 14. [3] Origen *hom.* vii *in Ies. Nav.* 6.
[4] S. Cyp. *Epp.* xvii 1, 3, xxx 5, xxxi 6: cp. xlix 2.
[5] *Ibid.* lix 16 sq.
[6] Cp. Origen *hom.* vii *in Ies. Nav.* 6, xii *in Ier.* 5.
[7] Cp. *Didasc.* ii 12 sqq., 33 § 3.
[8] S. Cyp. *Ep.* iv 4: *Didasc.* ii 6 § 11.

offender to accept and submit to the terms offered. No doubt he often submitted at once, and no complete breach of communion occurred. Otherwise, while the faithful in general were discouraged from intercourse with the excommunicate[1], it was the duty of the bishop not to abandon him, but to use every opportunity to exhort him to repentance and to the acceptance of the conditions of reconciliation[2]. But whether immediately or subsequently, whether spontaneously moved by his own conscience or persuaded by the exhortation of the bishop, it was for the offender to take the first step and to 'ask for penance.'[3] This request, we may suppose, was made first to the bishop, and then, under his direction, to the Church; and if the offender shewed signs of the right dispositions, what he asked for was 'not denied' him[4], but he was 'received to penitence'[5] and entered on the prescribed period of 'regular penance'[6] as one of the order of penitents.

i. As a penitent he again stood in a positive relation to the Church. He was once more in effect in the position of a catechumen and so far on his way to a new initiation in the sense of the recovery of the rights of his original and indelible initiation[7]. And as the relation of the catechumen to the Church was defined and symbolized by the place assigned to him in the congregation and the part allowed him in the Liturgy, so was the penitent's. He was excluded from the communion of the Eucharist, and therefore also from making his oblation—for if a man did not communicate,

[1] S. Cyp. *Ep.* lix 20: *Didasc.* iii 8 § 5.

[2] Origen *hom.* v *in Lev.* 4: S. Cyp. *Ep.* viii 2: *Didasc.* ii 20 § 4.

[3] *Didasc.* ii 50 § 4 episcopum uel ecclesiam depreçatus: Conc. Arelat. i *can.* 22 paenitentiam agere quaerunt: Neocaes. *can.* 7 *μετάνοιαν αἰτεῖν.*

[4] Conc. Elib. *can.* 22 placuit...paenitentiam non esse denegandam; but it might be 'difficult' to obtain, Conc. Neocaes. *can.* 2 *δυσχερὴς... ἡ μετάνοια.*

[5] Conc. Ancyr. *can.* 6 *ἐδέχθησαν εἰς μετάνοιαν*

[6] Legitima paenitentia, Elib. *can.* 5, 14, 31, 64, 76.

[7] Tert. *de Paenit.* 7: *Didasc.* ii 41 § 2.

neither might he offer[1]. For the rest, there were local differences of usage.

(*a*) In the West, the place of the penitents was outside the church, 'in the vestibule,' 'at the threshold,' 'before the doors.'[2] This was their station at the Mass, and there is nothing to shew that, like the catechumens, they were dismissed at any point in the course of it[3]. In the 5th century the historian Sozomen describes the contemporary use of the West, and particularly that of the Roman church, which purported to be traditional, and in fact has an air sufficiently archaic to represent approximately the usage of two centuries earlier. 'The penitents occupy a well-marked position, where they stand downcast and like mourners. And so soon as the Divine Liturgy is finished, without having communicated, they prostrate themselves on the earth with wailing and mourning. And the bishop in response hastens to them in tears, and in like manner falls on the ground with lamentation, and the whole multitude of the church is bathed in tears. And then the bishop rises first and raises up the prostrate penitents, and making a prayer, appropriate in behalf of penitent sinners, dismisses them.'[4]

(*b*) In Syria on the other hand, the excommunicates and penitents were treated like the heathen, and admitted to the Mass of the Catechumens, but were dismissed from the 'fellowship of prayer' after the sermon[5].

(*c*) In Asia Minor already by the middle of the 3rd century a more complicated organization was in use. The penitential process was divided into three stages[6],

[1] Conc. Elib. *can.* 28 episcopum placuit ab eo qui non communicat munus accipere non debere: *Didasc.* iv 8 § 3.

[2] Tert. *de Paenit.* 7, *de Pudicit.* 1, 3: S. Cyp. *Epp.* xxx 6, lvii 3.

[3] See A. Boudinhon 'La *Missa poenitentium* en occident' in *Revue d'hist. et de litt. religieuses* vii (1902) pp. 1 sqq.

[4] Sozomen *H.E.* vii 16.

[5] *Didasc.* ii 39, 41: Origen *in Mat. com. ser.* 89, *c. Cels.* iv 27: cp. Eus. *H.E.* vi 34.

[6] Οἱ ὡρισμένοι βαθμοί Conc. Ancyr. *can.* 21, 24, 25.

through which the penitent passed successively, spending a certain time in each stage, on his way to reconciliation[1]. The lowest stage was that of the 'Hearers,' the penitents at the beginning of their course, who were admitted to the Mass of the Catechumens, but dismissed summarily after the sermon[2]. The second stage was that of the 'Kneelers,' who were also dismissed before the Mass of the Faithful, but only after the faithful had prayed for them as they knelt prostrate on the ground[3]. The final stage was that of the 'Consistents,' who 'stood with' the faithful throughout the Liturgy and had part in the 'communion of prayer,' but neither offered nor communicated[4]. Although this system was recognized and applied by the canons of the Nicene Council and in this way received an ecumenical authorization, there is perhaps no trace of any practical use of it outside of Asia Minor.

ii. The way of a penitent was 'hard and toilsome.'[5] For penance was not a passive condition merely of deprivation. Not that as yet particular 'penances' were imposed[6], but the state of penance was conceived as one of 'godly sorrow' which actively expressed itself in mourning and prayer and fasting in private[7], and in the conventional signs of mourning and in self-

[1] S. Greg. Thaumat. *Ep. canonica*: Conc. Ancyr. *can.* 4—9, 16, 20—25: Nicaen. *can.* 11—13. Later in the 4th cent. the stage of the 'Weepers' (κλαίοντες) was recognized; but these were really only candidates for penance, not yet admitted. Cp. S. Greg. Thaumat. *μηδὲ τῆς ἀκροάσεως ἀξιῶσαι, τῆς ἀκροάσεως ἀπεῖρξαι.*

[2] Ἀκροᾶσθαι, ἀκροώμενοι, ἀκρόασις.

[3] Ὑποπίπτειν, ὑποπίπτοντες, ὑπόπτωσις: *ἐκκηρῦξαι τῶν εὐχῶν.*

[4] Συνεστῶτες, κοινωνεῖν τῶν εὐχῶν, εὐχῆς μόνης κοινωνῆσαι, κοινωνῆσαι χωρὶς προσφορᾶς (i.e. without communion), εὐχὴ χωρὶς προσφορᾶς: τῆς εὐχῆς ἀξιῶσαι. Cp. S. Dion. Al. ap. Eus. *H.E.* vii 9 § 5 *συνεστάναι ταῖς προσευχαῖς*, which implies that 'non-communicating attendance' was familiar in Egypt, and perhaps that the penitential 'stages' were used.

[5] Origen *hom.* ii *in Lev.* 4.

[6] *Didasc.* ii 16 § 2 is scarcely an exception to this.

[7] Hermas *Pastor* sim. vii 4: S. Cyp. *de Lapsis* 36.

humiliation in the congregation[1]; a discipline severe enough and humiliating enough to deter many, who ought to have done it, from entering on the way of *exomologesis*[2]. Tertullian more than once draws a picture of the penitents; and, Tertullian being Tertullian, such a picture drawn by his masterly pen is not likely to lack anything in the way of luridness of effect[3]. But even Tertullian only compares the humiliations and discomforts of the penitent to those a candidate for office is ready to submit to in his canvass for votes[4]. The picture suggested by S. Cyprian in Africa[5], or by Novatian and the Roman presbyters[6], or by Origen and the *Didascalia* in Syria[7], whatever its severity, wants something of the extravagance of effect which Tertullian has imported into his. But, whether more or less severe, the significance of the austerity was threefold: it was the expression in conventional terms of the penitent will, chastising its own lapse[8]; it was the 'amends' it offered to God[9]; and it was the proof it offered to the Church of its own sincerity, a great part of the evidence on which the Church proceeded in its final judgement[10].

The length of the period of penance varied with the gravity of the offence committed, with local temper, and with date. It ranged from a few weeks to all that remained of a lifetime. Various forms of conformity to paganism, for example, in one series of canons, incur

[1] S. Iren. *Haer.* i 13 § 5: Tert. *de Paenit.* 9: Conc. Nicaen. *can.* 12.
[2] Tert. *de Paenit.* 10 sq. [3] *Ibid.* 9, *de Pudicit.* 5, 13.
[4] Tert. *de Paenit.* 10: cp. S. Cyp. *ad Donat.* 11.
[5] S. Cyp. *Ep.* lv 23, 29, *de Lapsis* 30, 35 sq.
[6] ap. S. Cyp. *Ep.* xxx 8: but the Roman Gaius's description of Natalius's *exomologesis* (Eus. *H.E.* v 28 § 12) comes near to Tertullian's representation.
[7] Origen *hom. in Lev.* ii 4, xiv 4: *Didasc.* ii 16 § 2.
[8] S. Cyp. *de Lapsis* 29 paenitentiam criminis ueris doloribus exprimentes.
[9] Satisfactio: e.g. Tert. *de Paenit.* 8, 9, S. Cyp. *Ep.* lv 27, *de Lapsis* 29, 36. Cp. *ibid.* 16 expiata delicta...offensam placatam indignantis Domini.
[10] S. Cyp. *Ep.* xxx 8 animi signa prodiderunt; lv 23: Conc. Nic. *can.* 12.

from 2 years up to a lifelong penance, or, in another, from 2 years to 10[1]. In Syria, as represented by the *Didascalia*—and the text remains unchanged in the *Apostolic Constitutions*—the longest term contemplated is 7 weeks[2]; in Spain, no less than twenty-one offences incur lifelong excommunication[3]; while Asia Minor stands between the two extremes, and the penances imposed at Neocaesarea, Ancyra, and Nicaea, range mostly from 2 to 13 years, in only one case is it as long as 20 or 30 years according to the age of the offender, and a lifelong penance is very rare[4]. And while a lifelong penance was required of those who sacrificed in the Decian persecution[5], the longest term imposed by the Council of Ancyra on any apostates in the Great Persecution,—and those, such apostates as not only themselves sacrificed but forced others to do the like,—was 10 years[6].

Outside of Asia Minor the penitential period was one of uniform discipline and exclusion from the communion of the Eucharist, and all the disabilities that went along with this. In Asia Minor, as we have seen, the course was graduated, and the penitent recovered his rights and privileges by stages. The canons therefore commonly define, either generally that the penitent is to proceed 'by stages,'[7] or in particular how long he is to spend in each of the three classes, unless the first or the third stage, or both of them, be dispensed with, the longest time being, uniformly, passed in the middle stage.

[1] Conc. Elib. *can.* 3, 40, 55, 57, 59: Ancyra *can.* 4—9.

[2] *Didasc.* ii 16 § 2: *Ap. Const.* ii 16 § 2.

[3] Conc. Elib. *can.* 1—3, 6—8, 10, 12, 13, 17, 18, 47, 63—66, 70—73, 75. See further p. 376 below.

[4] Ancyr. 16, 22, Neocaes. 2.

[5] S. Cyp. *Ep.* lv 17.

[6] Ancyra 9. The longest penance imposed on apostates in Peter of Alexandria's premature canons of 306 (Routh *Rell. sacr.* iv pp. 23 sqq.) is 4 years.

[7] *κατὰ τοὺς βαθμοὺς τοὺς ὡρισμένους* Ancyr. 21.

iii. In some instances the penance was shortened and the penitent absolved before the assigned period was over. The Nicene Council enforces it as a point of the 'common law' that a penitent whose life is despaired of should be admitted to communion at once; at the same time requiring him, in the event of recovery, to 'finish the time,' as a 'consistent.'[1] In 252, in view of the threatened renewal of persecution, all the penitent *lapsi* in Africa were absolved, in order that they might be strengthened by communion to meet the new trial[2]. And, as the catechumenate was shortened for those catechumens who shewed exceptional zeal, so some canons expressly provide for the exercise of indulgence in the case of those penitents who prove to be especially earnest in their conversion[3].

Otherwise, the 'full and regular period of satisfaction'[4] completed, there remained to be done the final act, the reconciliation of the penitent. No description of it in detail survives; but its essential features are not difficult to discern.

In the first place, it was required that the absolution be granted by the church in which the offender was excommunicated. It was a principle of the 'common law' that 'those who were ejected by one church should not be received by another.'[5] *En revanche*, a certain restraint was put on the suffragan churches by the province; and it was ruled at Nicaea that two pro-

[1] Conc. Nicaen. *can.* 13: with the latter provision contrast S. Cyp. *Ep.* lv 13: he holds that a penitent once absolved should not be required to resume his penance; so also S. Dion. Al. *Ep. ad Conon.* (ed. Feltoe p. 60).

[2] S. Cyp. *Ep.* lvii.

[3] Ancyra 5 *τοὺς δὲ ἐπισκόπους ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν τὸν τρόπον τῆς ἐπιστροφῆς δοκιμάσαντας φιλανθρωπεύεσθαι* (and also, in the opposite case, *πλείονα προστιθέναι χρόνον*): Nicaea 12 *μετὰ τοῦ ἐξεῖναι τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ καὶ φιλανθρωπότερόν τι περὶ αὐτῶν βουλεύσασθαι.*

[4] S. Cyp. *Ep.* lxiv 1 legitimum et plenum tempus satisfactionis: Conc. Neocaes. *can.* 3 *ὁ ὡρισμένος χρόνος.*

[5] Conc. Nicaen. *can.* 5 *τὸν κανόνα τὸν διαγορεύοντα τοὺς ὑφ' ἑτέρων ἀποβληθέντας ὑφ' ἑτέρων μὴ προσίεσθαι*: Elib. *can.* 53: Arelat. i *can.* 16.

vincial councils should be held in each year, before Lent and in the autumn, to review the local sentences of excommunication, and if necessary to revise them[1].

The process of reconciliation included four steps[2].

(*a*) The first step was the *Exomologesis*; for, although the whole penitential course is commonly spoken of as *exomologesis*, yet it is clear that the word properly denoted the final act of the penitent[3], in which he appeared in the congregation in his penitential weeds and, prostrating himself before the ministers and the people in turn, sorrowfully acknowledged his offence, implored the prayers of the Church, and petitioned for absolution[4].

(*b*) The whole church, *plebs* and *ordo* alike, had to be satisfied, by the evidence of his life as a penitent, of the reality of his conversion and his fitness to be reconciled[5]. It seems that, in ordinary cases at least, it was the bishop who 'introduced' the penitent 'into the church' to make his *exomologesis*, and that he had therefore already satisfied himself, and it remained only to satisfy the clergy and the people by himself bearing witness to the worthiness of the penitent and com-

[1] Conc. Nicaen. *can.* 5. A like arrangement existed in Cappadocia 70 years before: S. Firmilian ap. S. Cyp. *Ep.* lxxv 4.

[2] S. Cyp. *Epp.* iv 4 aestimato iusto tempore postea exomologesi facta ad ecclesiam redeat: xv 1 actam paenitentiam,.. exomologesim .. factam,.. manum ab episcopo et clero in paenitentiam inpositam, offerre pro illis et eucharistiam dare: xvi 2 (of *lapsi* prematurely reconciled) ad communicationem admittuntur et offertur nomine eorum et nondum paenitentia acta, nondum exomologesi facta, nondum manu eis ab episcopo et clero inposita, eucharistia illis datur: xvii 2 paenitentia agatur iusto tempore et exomologesis fiat inspecta uita eius qui agit paenitentiam, nec ad communicationem uenire quis possit nisi prius illi ab episcopo et clero manus fuerit inposita.

[3] See preceding note, and *Epp.* iv 4, xviii 1, xix 1, xx 3.

[4] Tert. *de Paenit.* 9, *de Pudicit.* 5, 11: S. Cyp. *Ep.* lv 11, 29.

[5] S. Cyp. *Epp.* xvii (to the laity) 2 exomologesis fiat inspecta uita eius qui agit paenitentiam: 1 examinabuntur singula praesentibus et iudicantibus uobis: 3 uestram sententiam (the particular reference of the last two passages is to the examination of some martyrs' recommendation of certain *lapsi* for reconciliation): lvii 5 colligere intra castra milites Christi et examinatis singulorum causis pacem lapsis dare.

mending him to their indulgence[1]. As was the case in the election of ordinands[2], the requirement of satisfaction on both sides sometimes occasioned a struggle, and one side or the other had to give way. At least, it is clear that the bishop could not proceed to the absolution of the penitent without the consent and the petition of the laity[3]; whether on the other hand he could in the last resort veto the favourable judgement of the people, and refuse their petition, is not so clear.

(*c*) The petition of the laity having been made and accepted, the penitent was absolved by prayer and the imposition of the hands of the bishop and the clergy[4].

(*d*) It may be inferred by analogy that, like baptisms and ordinations, absolutions were conferred in the course of the Liturgy after the dismissal of the catechumens. The restored penitent therefore once more took his place among the faithful: he was commemorated individually in the prayers, and at the communion he received the Eucharist[5], thus once more exercising his *ius communicationis*[6].

iv. It was noted above, in passing, that there were cases in which the restoration of the excommunicate to the communion of the Church was not contemplated.

(*a*) The rule of 'one *exomologesis*' was generally recognized[7]: that is to say, no one could be admitted

[1] Tert. *de Pudicit.* 11. [2] Eus. *H.E.* vi 43 § 17.

[3] S. Cyp. *Epp.* lxiv 1 petitu et conscientia plebis: lix 15. Cp. Eus. *H.E.* vi 43 § 6.

[4] P. 372 n. 2 above: Origen *de Orat.* 28 § 9: *Didasc.* ii 18 § 7, 41 § 2.

[5] P. 372 n. 2 above.

[6] S. Cyp. *Ep.* xvi 2 per manus inpositionem episcopi et cleri ius communicationis accipiant. But *only* ius communicationis; for clerical penitents were only restored to lay communion: Origen *c. Cels.* iii 51: S. Cyp. *Epp.* lv 11, lxxii 2: *Sentt. epp.* 4: Eus. *H.E.* vi 43 § 10.

[7] Hermas *Pastor* mand. iv 1, 3: Clem. Al. *Strom.* ii 13 § 56 sq.: Tert. *de Paenit.* 7, 9: Origen *hom.* xv *in Lev.* 2: cp. *Didasc.* ii 43 § 4. But the heretics Cerdon, Marcion and Valentinus are related to have been repeatedly put to penance by the Roman Church (S. Iren. *Haer.* iii 4 § 2, Tert. *Praesc.* 30).

to public penance more than once with any hope of absolution; after baptism and one penance there was no third 'plank' on which the shipwrecked could swim to shore[1]. Consequently an offender once absolved, if he relapsed or committed some other grave offence, though he might spend the rest of his life as a penitent, could only look for the divine remission: the Church refused the responsibility of absolving him a second time, and reserved his case to God.

(*b*) In some quarters, for a while, it was held that for certain grave sins the Church ought not to give absolution. The history of the question is obscure; but it was already being discussed in the middle of the 2nd century, when the *Shepherd* of Hermas was a manifesto in favour of 'one repentance' for all sins[2]; and a quarter of a century later S. Dionysius of Corinth urged upon the church of Amastris and the churches of Pontus to reconcile all who 'returned from whatsoever lapse, whether moral offence or heretical error.'[3] Some time in the early 3rd century a group of African bishops were of opinion that peace ought not to be granted to fornicators and that even public penance should be refused to adulterers[4]. And when the Roman bishop Callistus (218—223), under circumstances which are unknown, notified that it was his practice to absolve sins of the flesh after penance[5], he was doubly attacked. Tertullian, who fifteen years before, as a Catholic, in the *de Paenitentia* had treated all sins as remissible after penance[6], now, as a Montanist, assailed Callistus with characteristic bitterness, maintaining that all capital sins, and in particular Idolatry, Homicide, and Unchastity[7],

[1] Tert. *de Paenit.* 4, 12: cp. S. Jerome *Epp.* lxxix 10, cxxii 4, cxlvii 3, &c.

[2] Hermas *Pastor* mand. iv 1, 3.

[3] Eus. *H.E.* iv 23 § 6.

[4] S. Cyp. *Ep.* lv 21.

[5] Tert. *de Pudicit.* 1.

[6] Tert. *de Paenit.* 4.

[7] The three sins of the apostolic decree (Acts xv 29, xxi 25) in its 'Western' or 'moral' form (S. Iren. *Haer.* iii 12 § 14, Tert. *de Pudicit.* 12, S. Cyp. *Testim.* iii 119), which Mgr Batiffol describes as 'la plus ingénieuse des fausses décrétales' (*Études* i p. 85). See also Tert. *de Idol.* 1, 2, 11.

are 'irremissible'; that is to say, though the Church has authority to remit them, yet this authority ought not to be used, lest encouragement be given to offenders: they are the 'sin unto death' for which the Church may not 'pray'; the pardon of them is reserved to God, and the offender for all his penance has no hope of reconciliation in this world[1]. Later, Hippolytus, now an anti-pope and the bishop of a schism, assailed the memory of Callistus with equal bitterness on this among other grounds, holding with Tertullian that Idolatry, Homicide, and Unchastity are irremissible[2]. But whereas Tertullian had represented that Callistus refused to absolve Idolatry and Homicide and therefore charged him with inconsistency in absolving Unchastity, the complaint of Hippolytus is that Callistus was 'the first to devise a concession to men's passions by declaring that he absolved all sins.'[3] In the East, Origen, whether with reference to Callistus or not is unknown, is disquieted because 'some giving themselves a licence beyond what belongs to the sacerdotal office and perhaps without an accurate grasp of the sacerdotal science, boast that they are able to pardon cases of idolatry and to remit cases of adultery and fornication.'[4] These are the obvious and superficial facts of an episode which is difficult to interpret in detail, even after the endless discussions of recent years[5]. It is sufficient for the present purpose to note the existence of the two currents of opinion, rigourist and moderate; and to note further that by the middle of the 3rd century the rigourist attitude towards the remission of sins of the flesh had disappeared in Africa and Italy—even Novatian did not

[1] Tert. *de Pudicit.* 2 sq., 18 sq., 21.

[2] Cp. S. Hippol. *in Prov.* xxiv. 50 sq. [xxx 15 sq.].

[3] S. Hippol. *Philosoph.* ix 12.

[4] Origen *de Orat.* 28 § 9.

[5] See Mgr Batiffol *Études d'hist. et théol. positive* cap. ii; and the articles of the Abbé A. d'Alès 'Tertullien et Calliste' in *Revue d'hist. ecclés.* xiii (1912).

adopt it[1]; and there is some reason to suppose that Origen later on changed his opinion. As to Idolatry, the policy worked out in concert by Carthage and Rome in the Decian crisis, offering reconciliation to *libellatici* after penance proportionate to the gravity of the lapse in each individual case, and to *sacrificati* only at the end after a lifelong penance[2], was generally adopted after some hesitations[3], and the rigourists, who refused all reconciliation to the lapsed, were drained off into the Novatianist sect, which later on enlarged its progamme and denied the right of the Church to absolve any mortal sin. Wilful Homicide, it may be supposed, was a case that had but rarely to be dealt with. Of the only two canons which refer to it, the 22nd of Ancyra offers absolution after a lifelong penance in the second class; the 6th of Eliberis, where the case contemplated is that of murder by means of magic, refuses absolution even at the end, explicitly on the ground that the murder is aggravated by 'idolatry.'

(*c*) Not only in this case, but in 18 others of the 21 cases in which, as we have seen, the Council of Eliberis sets no term short of the end, reconciliation is refused even *in fine*. This may indicate the survival of a rigourist tradition in a Catholic community. Or it may mean that special severity was felt to be necessary in the deplorable moral condition of the Spanish church which the canons as a whole reveal. However this may be, the sins so dealt with are specially aggravated offences; one is an instance of deliberate and gratuitous idolatry[4]; another, of grave sin persisted in to the end, leaving no time for penance (64); four are cases of aggravated sins of the flesh or sins against marriage (8, 66, 71, 72); two are cases of relapse,

[1] S. Cyp. *Ep.* lv 26. [2] *Ibid.* lv 17.

[3] S. Dion. Al. ap. Eus. *H.E.* vii 5 §§ 1 sq.

[4] *Can.* 1. Gratuitous because not committed under pressure of persecution. I accept Mgr Duchesne's dating of the Council as earlier than the outbreak of the Great Persecution (*Mélanges Renier*, 1887, pp. 159 sqq.).

falling under the general rule of 'one *exomologesis*' (7, 47); two are condemned as implying scandal given to the Church (18, 65); four are marked explicitly as double offences, involving two capital sins (2, 6, 12, 63); and the remaining four (13, 17, 73, 75), though not explicitly marked as double, seem to be of the same character.

Elsewhere than in Spain, there appear to be only two other cases in which final reconciliation was refused, both of them cases of sins persisted in to the end. The 2nd canon of Neocaesarea refuses absolution to a woman who has married her deceased husband's brother, except 'by way of indulgence' (διὰ τὴν φιλανθρωπίαν) if she promise in case of recovery to dissolve the union; and the 22nd canon of Arles forbids the reconciliation of apostates who, having never in time of health 'sought for penance,' 'ask for communion' in time of sickness[1].

IV

To sum up the results we have reached.

First, the conditions of *admission* to the communion of the Church, expressed or implied in the process of initiation, were the following. The final and immediate condition was what was described as 'Baptism'[2]; that is to say, Baptism in the narrower sense, 'the laver of regeneration,' administered in the Name of the Father

[1] So the Carthaginian Council of 251 had refused reconciliation to Decian *sacrificati* who sought it only when 'in peril' of death (S. Cyp. *Ep.* lv 23). In Egypt, on the other hand, S. Dionysius had given orders that *all* should be absolved *in extremis* if they prayed for it (Eus. *H.E.* vi 44 § 4).

[2] 'Baptism' commonly meant baptism and confirmation, regarded as two moments in a single action (e.g. Tert. *de Baptismo*: Origen *in Rom.* v 8, *de Princip.* i 3 § 2: S. Cyp. *Ep.* lxiii 8). It was only when it was necessary to distinguish them, as in the discussion of heretical baptisms, that they were distinguished and *utrumque sacramentum* was used (S. Cyp. *Epp.* lxxii 1, lxxiii 21: *Sentt. epp.* 5).

and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, or, admissibly, in the Name of Jesus Christ, together with Confirmation, 'the renewal of the Holy Ghost,' conferred by prayer and the imposition, mediate or immediate, of the hand of the bishop[1]. This condition was so far qualified, that one who died a martyr for the Faith before receiving the Baptism of the Church was held to be baptized in his own blood[2]; while a person baptized in emergency and out of reach of the bishop, and dying before he had opportunity to be confirmed, was reckoned to have

[1] (i) In the summary description of Baptism in *Didache* 7 there is no mention of Confirmation. As to this it may be remarked that, if the *Didache* represents any real stage in the growth of the Church and if the 'apostles and prophets' are the link between the Apostles and the Episcopate, the administration of Confirmation belonged to the 'apostles and prophets' and did not therefore come within the scope of the *Didache*, which is a directory for the local community. (ii) In S. Justin Martyr's still shorter account (*Apol.* i 61) there is also no express mention of Confirmation. On this three things may be remarked. (*a*) Confirmation was not so conspicuous an action as to call for explicit mention in a summary apologetic account addressed to pagans; while (*b*) it may well be that the prayer 'for the newly baptized' among the 'common prayers' which immediately followed the neophyte's entry into the church after his baptism (c. 65) is in fact his Confirmation; and (*c*) in the Liturgy following baptism, the kiss of peace, which is not mentioned in the account of the ordinary Sunday Liturgy (c. 67), immediately follows the prayers—and as we have already seen, in the Hippolytean *Order* the bishop kisses the neophyte after Confirmation (see p. 349 above: cp. S. Cyp. *Ep.* lxiv 4; a survival remains in the *Pax tecum* of the Gelasian Sacramentary and the later Roman rite). (iii) According to a letter of S. Cornelius (Eus. *H.E.* vi 43 § 15), Novatian, after being clinically baptized in sickness, did not seek Confirmation after his recovery. The fragments, which are all that survive of the letter, leave it uncertain whether Cornelius means to say that Novatian was ordained presbyter without previous Confirmation. But his ordination was strongly opposed by all the clergy and many of the laity on the ground of his clinical baptism, and it was only conceded at last as an exceptional case to the petition of the then pope (*ib.* § 17 *ἠξίωσε συγχωρηθῆναι αὐτῷ τοῦτον μόνον χειροτονῆσαι*); and it seems unlikely, especially in view of 'the rule of the Church,' to which Cornelius refers (§ 15), that the pope would weaken his case by not confirming Novatian before ordaining him.

[2] See above, p. 331 note 1. For catechumens dying before they could be baptized see S. Firmilian in S. Cyp. *Ep.* lxxv 21 and Conc. Elib. *can.* 77. Firmilian apparently does not, as does the Council, regard their faith and intention as an equivalent for baptism, but as bringing them 'no small gain.'

died 'a perfect Christian.'[1] As a preliminary condition and to secure that he received baptism with the right will and disposition, viz. with repentance and faith[2], the candidate was required publicly to 'renounce ungodliness and worldly lusts,' and to make 'the good confession' of the Faith of the Church 'before many witnesses.' And lastly, in order that he might be the better able to fulfil this condition with understanding and sincerity, he spent two or three years of instruction and discipline in the status of a catechumen; and to this status he was admitted only on condition of shewing that his motives for seeking admission were honest, and of consenting to abandon all unchristian manners of life; while at the end of each of the two periods into which the catechumenate was divided his life and his progress were scrutinized, and his further promotion was dependent on the result of the scrutiny.

Secondly, *continuance* in the enjoyment of the *ius communicationis* was conditional upon the continued observance of the obligations implied and accepted in Baptism. For certain offences, notably Idolatry, Heresy, Schism, and grave moral lapses like Homicide, Uncleanness and Fraud, the Christian, in some instances *ipso facto*, in others by a judicial process, was excommunicated, that is, he was excluded from the Communion of the Eucharist and from all his Christian rights and was reckoned as 'a heathen man and a publican.'

But, thirdly, except for some few offences, and then only in some churches and during a certain period, he was not excluded from the hope of *restoration*. On giving evidence of penitence and purpose of amendment, he was on his own petition received back in the status of a Penitent. As a Penitent, for a period, longer or

[1] *de Rebaptismate* 4 quod hodierna quoque die non potest dubitari esse usitatum et euenire solitum, ut plerique post baptisma sine impositione manus episcopi de saeculo exeant et tamen pro perfectis fidelibus habentur.

[2] *de Rebaptismate* 4 paenitenti atque credenti. Cp. p. 316 above.

shorter according to the gravity of his offence, during which he was bound still by his bearing and manner of life to give evidence of his 'conversion,' he had, while still deprived of the Communion of the Eucharist, once more a recognized place in the congregation and for at least some part of the period some share in its worship. At the end of his appointed time of penance, he petitioned for complete restoration, once more professing his repentance; and if in the judgement of the Church his conversion was real and satisfactory, he was absolved by prayer and the imposition of the hands of the bishop and the clergy, and so regained his status as one of 'the faithful.'

B

THE MINISTRATION OF THE SACRAMENTS

We have already had occasion to notice incidentally the place of the *ordo*, the *episcopus et clerus*, in the administration of Baptism and Confirmation, the Eucharist, and Penance. It remains to consider this more in detail, and to enquire who was held to be the proper 'minister' of each of the Sacraments—whose intervention, that is, was necessary in order to guarantee the authority of the Church and secure the validity of the action.

For this purpose it will be convenient, first, to enquire as to each order of the ministry what was the authority, in relation to the administration of the sacraments, either explicitly conferred in ordination, or understood to be included in its commission and normally exercised by it; and then, reviewing the administration of each of the sacraments in turn, to observe how far competence in this respect belonged to others besides those who normally exercised it.

I

1. The Bishop then, as the highpriest[1], has plenary competence in respect of the Sacraments, and is the normal minister of them all. To apply to the sacraments in general what S. Firmilian of Caesarea says of baptism in particular, 'the authority' to administer them 'was given to the apostles and to the churches which they, sent by Christ, established, and' therein 'to the bishops who succeeded them by ordination in their stead.'[2] Accordingly in the earliest form of episcopal consecration that remains[3], petition is made for the bishop that he may 'shepherd thy holy flock and do thee highpriestly service, blamelessly ministering night and day, and without ceasing may propitiate thy face and offer thee the oblations of thy holy Church,' as the minister of the Eucharist; 'and by the highpriestly Spirit he may have authority to remit sins according to thy precept' and 'to loose every bond according to the authority which thou didst give to the apostles,' as the minister of Absolution; and may 'confer orders[4] according to thy

[1] Tert. *de Bapt.* 17 summus sacerdos, qui est episcopus: S. Hippol. *Philosoph.* praef. *τὸ ἐν Ἐκκλησίᾳ παραδοθὲν ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, οὗ τυχόντες πρότεροι οἱ ἀπόστολοι μετέδοσαν τοῖς ὀρθῶς πεπιστευκόσιν· ὧν ἡμεῖς* (the bishops) *διάδοχοι τυγχάνοντες τῆς τε αὐτῆς χάριτος μετέχοντες ἀρχιερατείας τε καὶ διδασκαλίας καὶ φρουροὶ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας λελογισμένοι κτλ.*: *Didasc.* ii 26 § 3 isti enim primi sacerdotes uestri, § 4 primus uero sacerdos uobis est leuita episcopus.

[2] ap. S. Cyp. *Ep.* lxxv 16 potestas ergo peccatorum remittendorum apostolis data est et ecclesiis quas illi a Christo missi constituerunt et episcopis qui eis ordinatione uicaria successerunt: cp. 7 quando omnis potestas et gratia in ecclesia constituta sit, ubi praesident maiores natu qui et baptizandi et manum imponendi et ordinandi possident potestatem.

[3] S. Hippol. *Order* 1: see above p. 279.

[4] *Διδόναι κλήρους.* The origin of this use of *κλῆρος* is perhaps to be found in Acts i 17 *ἔλαχε τὸν κλῆρον τῆς διακονίας ταύτης* (paralleled in *v.* 25 by *λαβεῖν τὸν τόπον τῆς διακονίας ταύτης*). Elsewhere (1) it seems to occur first in Irenaeus, where *ὁ κλῆρος* means the 'portion,' 'estate,' 'office,' of the episcopate in a particular church: *Haer.* iii 3 § 3 *δωδεκάτῳ τόπῳ τὸν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων κατέχει κλῆρον*; and so, the position of a bishop in a local succession: i 27 § 1 *ἔνατον κλῆρον τῆς ἐπισκοπικῆς δια-*

commandment,' as the minister of Ordination. This, as it is the earliest, is also the most explicit of all ancient consecration-prayers in its enumeration of the functions of the episcopate[1]; but the enumeration is incomplete.

Looking elsewhere, we may take a few typical documents and observe what is taken for granted as to the contents of the episcopal authority.

δοχῆς...ἔχοντος. So also Eusebius, *H.E.* iv 10, vi 29 § 2, vii 2. Cp. Tert. *de Virg. Vel.* 9 sacerdotalis officii sortem. (2) More commonly κλῆρος means a 'portion,' 'estate,' 'order,' in the ministry generally: Clem. Al. *Quis dives* 42 κλήρῳ ἕνα γέ τινα κληρώσων: Origen *hom.* xi *in Ier.* 3 ἀπὸ κλήρου τινὸς προκαθεζόμενοι: S. Peter Al. *can.* 10 τοῖς ἀπὸ κλήρου αὐτομολήσαντας: S. Hippol. *Philos.* ix 12 ἐν κλήρῳ εἶναι, 'to be in orders,' *Order* 4 § 3 [the confessor] 'is worthy of every κλῆρος': Gaius ap. Eus. *H.E.* v 28 § 12 οἱ ἐν κλήρῳ, 'the clergy': S. Cornelius ap. Eus. *H.E.* vi 43 § 17 εἰς κλῆρόν τινα γενέσθαι, 'to be ordained to an order': *de Rebaptismate* 12 clero aliquo honoratus: *Liber pontificalis* xv [Victor] fecit sequentes cleros, 'instituted minor orders'?: S. Hippol. *u.s.* καθίστασθαι εἰς κλήρους, of bishops, presbyters, and deacons, 'to be ordained to [their several] orders'; and with the order defined, S. Cornelius *u.s.* τοῦ ἐπισκόπου τοῦ ἐπιθέντος αὐτῷ τὴν χεῖρα εἰς πρεσβυτερίου κλῆρον. Thus διδόναι κλήρους would seem to be the precise equivalent of 'to confer orders.' (In 1 Pet. v 3 κλῆροι appears to mean the 'charges,' in the sense of the flocks, committed to the 'pastors': cp. Eus. *H.E.* x 4 § 61 τῶν αὐτῷ κεκληρωμένων ψυχῶν: and S. Athan. *Apol. c. Arian.* 6 τὸν κλῆρον τοῦ Θεοῦ, καθ' ὃν ἐτάχθη τις, of a bishop's charge, is in part analogous.) (3) Ὁ κλῆρος, *clerus*, is 'the clergy': Tert. *de Monog.* 12 (*clerus* is the sum of the *ecclesiastici ordines*): S. Hippol. *Philos.* ix 12 τὴν κατάστασιν τοῦ κλήρου: S. Cyp. *passim*: Cornelius *u.s.*: Conc. Ancyr. *can.* 3, Nicaen. *can.* 1—3, Arelat. i *can.* 13 ordo cleri; and the members of it are *clerici*, S. Cyp. *Epp.* xxix, &c.: Conc. Elib. *can.* 27, 50, &c.: Constantine ap. Eus. *H.E.* x 7 § 2. Κληροῦν in this reference is used for 'to appoint' or 'ordain,' Clem. Al. *supra*: Gaius ap. Eus. *H.E.* v 28 § 10 ἐπίσκοπος κληρωθῆναι; and κληροῦσθαι for 'to be allotted,' S. Iren. *Haer.* iii 3 § 3 τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν κληροῦται Κλήμης: so Eus. *H.E.* iii 2, 4 § 8, 5 § 2, 36 § 2, iv 1.

[1] This prayer has had a long history. With some addition or modification it passed into the *Apostolic Constitutions*, the *Canons of Hippolytus*, and the *Testament of the Lord*. From the *Apostolic Constitutions* it was adopted into the Coptic consecration of bishop (Denzinger *Rit. orient.* ii p. 23) and patriarch (*ibid.* 48) and the Maronite consecration of a bishop (*ibid.* 200); and from the *Testament*, into the consecration of the Maronite patriarch (*ibid.* 220); and it is still in use in these rites. The prayer of *Clem. Hom.* iii 72 (S. Clement's consecration by S. Peter), which is also in use in the consecration of the Coptic bishop and patriarch (Denzinger ii pp. 22, 46), specifies, of the bishop's prerogatives, only the authority to bind and loose.

The *Didascalia apostolorum* is a Syrian manual of Church life, addressed chiefly to the Christian people and the bishop, directing each how rightly to fulfil their well-understood functions, and reminding them of their obligations. And here, the Bishop is the 'highpriest,' who 'loosed you from your sins, regenerating you by water'[1]; 'through whom, in your baptism, by the imposition of the bishop's hand the Lord witnessed' to your sonship and 'gave you the Holy Ghost' and 'you were sealed'[2]; 'through the bishops the oblations are offered to the Lord God for remission of sins,'[3] it is the bishop who gives thanks over the bread and the chalice[4], and 'makes us partakers of the holy Eucharist of God'[5]; it is the bishop who 'has authority to judge in behalf of God' and 'whose place is as the place of Almighty God,' since it is to the bishops that it was said *Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven* and the rest, and it is for them, who have so 'received the authority of remission of sins,' to 'lay hands' on 'those who have sinned' and to 'give remission'[6]; and lastly, while the treatment of Ordination in detail does not come within the scope of the *Didascalia*, the bishop is to select those whom he thinks worthy and to make them presbyters, deacons or sub-deacons[7]. Thus it is assumed that the Bishop is the minister of Baptism, Confirmation, the Eucharist, Absolution, and Ordination.

In the West, the writings of S. Cyprian yield the same result. The Bishop 'cleanses and hallows' the water of baptism and himself baptizes[8]; the baptized 'by the prayer and imposition of the hands' of the bishop 'receive the Holy Ghost and are consummated

[1] *Didasc.* ii 26 §§ 3, 4: 33 § 2; cp. iii 12 § 3.
[2] *Ibid.* ii 32 § 3, 33 §§ 1, 2.
[3] *Ibid.* ii 26 § 2, 54 § 1.
[4] *Ibid.* ii 58 § 3.
[5] *Ibid.* ii 33 § 2.
[6] *Ibid.* ii 11 § 2, 18 §§ 1 sq., 34 § 4, 41 § 2.
[7] *Ibid.* ii 34 § 3, iii 12 § 1.
[8] S. Cyp. *ad Fortunat.* praef. 4, *Epp.* lxix 8, lxx 1.

with the Seal of the Lord'[1]; the bishop 'serves the altar and the sacrifices,'[2] and 'discharging the office of Christ' 'offers a true and perfect sacrifice in the Church to God the Father,'[3] in his 'prayer' at the altar[4] asking for 'the sound estate of the people' and commemorating the names of the dead in 'the sacrifice for their repose'[5]; 'in virtue of the force of his episcopate and the authority of his chair' and in the exercise of 'the authority of his office' the bishop administers discipline and deposes or excommunicates[6], 'with' him the penitent 'makes his *exomologesis* of conscience,'[7] and, 'by the imposition of the hands of the bishop and clergy, receives the *ius communicationis*'[8]; after election by the 'suffrage' of the clergy and people of a vacant see and the 'judgement' of the neighbouring bishops, a new prelate is consecrated by the bishops[9], and, with the approval of clergy and people, himself ordains the persons so approved to other orders of the ministry[10]. Again then the Bishop is the minister of Baptism, Confirmation, the Eucharist, Penance, and Ordination.

Once more, we may examine the canons of the Councils, Eastern and Western, of the first quarter of the 4th century, and observe what are the functions incidentally ascribed to the Bishop. And here, after Baptism, the bishop 'perfects' the neophyte 'by benediction' or 'imposition of hands' in Confirmation[11]; he 'offers,' and a provincial bishop must be provided with 'an opportunity' to celebrate the Eucharist when he

[1] S. Cyp. *Epp.* lxxiii 9.
[2] *Ibid.* lxxii 2.
[3] *Ibid.* lxiii 14: cp. lvii 3.
[4] *Ibid.* i 2 sacerdotum prece: lxv 2 precem Domini: lxvii 2 precibus: *de Laps.* 25 precis nostrae et orationis.
[5] *Epp.* i 2, lxvii 2.
[6] *Ibid.* iii 1, 3.
[7] *de Laps.* 28.
[8] *Ep.* xvi 2: cp. xv 1, xvii 2.
[9] *Ibid.* lv 8, lxvii 2, 3, 5.
[10] *Ibid.* xxix, xxxix 4 sq., of ordinations of minor clerics: Cyprian does not happen to mention any ordinations of presbyters or deacons.
[11] Conc. Elib. *can.* 38, 77.

comes to the City[1]; the bishop excommunicates, and the penitent must 'do his penance with' his bishop and from him receive his reconciliation[2]; the bishop, himself consecrated by at least three comprovincial bishops[3], ordains deacons and presbyters[4].

2. The Presbyters are the 'counsellors of the bishop,' with him forming the 'council of God,' 'the council and senate of the Church.' They are the bishop's 'symmystae' and his 'compresbyters.'[5] And this relation of the presbyters to the bishop is symbolized by their place in the congregation. The bishop 'presides,' enthroned on his *cathedra*, in relation to the presbyters occupying 'the chief seat'[6]; while the presbyters sit beside him 'in the presbyterium'[7] 'round about the throne,'[8] as prelates 'of the second throne,'[9] in relation to the people sharing 'the chief seat,' forming with the bishop the 'ecclesiastici ordinis consessus' and the 'garland' on the head of the church[10].

[1] Conc. Arelat. i *can.* 19 de episcopis peregrinis qui in urbem solent uenire, placuit iis locum dari ut offerant.

[2] Conc. Elib. *can.* 32, 53. [3] Conc. Arelat. i *can.* 20, Nic. *can.* 4.

[4] Conc. Ancyr. *can.* 13, Nic. *can.* 19.

[5] *Didasc.* ii 28 § 4 *σύμβουλοι τοῦ ἐπισκόπου...συνέδριον καὶ βουλὴ τῆς ἐκκλησίας*: S. Ignat. *Trall.* 3 *συνέδριον Θεοῦ*: *Apost. Ch. Order* 18 *συμμύσται τοῦ ἐπισκόπου*: for *συμπρεσβύτεροι, compresbyteri* see S. Dion. Al. ap. Eus. *H.E.* vii 11 § 3, 5 § 6: S. Cyp. *Epp.* i 1, xlv 2, &c.: Eus. *H.E.* v 16 § 5.

[6] *Didasc.* ii 57 § 4 et in medio inter eos situm sit episcopi solium: S. Ignat. *Magn.* 6 *προκαθημένου τοῦ ἐπισκόπου*: Origen *in Mat.* xv 26 *πρωεδρία ἐπισκοπικοῦ θρόνου* (cp. Eus. *H.E.* ii 17 § 23): for *πρωτοκαθεδρία* see Clem. Al. *Strom.* v 13 § 106, Orig. *in Mat.* xvi 22, Eus. *H.E.* v 28 § 12: *cathedra* S. Cyp. *Ep.* xvii 2, &c.

[7] *Didasc.* ii 57 § 4 et cum eo sedeant presbyteri: cp. S. Cyp. *Epp.* xxxix 5, xl, xlv 2: Eus. *H.E.* x 4 §§ 44, 66: Origen *hom.* xi *in Ier.* 3 *καθέζεσθαι ἐν πρεσβυτερίῳ*: Conc. Ancyr. *can.* 18.

[8] Apoc. iv 4. For the correspondence between the arrangement of the church and that of the ideal church of the Apocalypse, see *Apost. Ch. Order* 18: cp. Clem. Al. *Strom.* iv 8 § 66; vi 13 § 107.

[9] Eus. *H.E.* x 5 § 23 *τῶν ἐκ τοῦ δευτέρου θρόνου.*

[10] *πρωτοκάθεδρῖται* Hermas *Pastor* vis. iii 9 § 7: cp. Origen *in Mat.* xvi 22. Tert. *de Exhort. Cast.* 7: cp. S. Cyp. *Ep.* xl. S. Ignat. *Magn.* 13 *ἀξιοπλόκου πνευματικοῦ στεφάνου τοῦ πρεσβυτερίου ὑμῶν*: *Didasc.* ii 28 § 4 *τῆς ἐκκλησίας στέφανος.*

In administration, then, they form a college with the bishop; and as in the Hippolytean prayer for the consecration of a bishop it is asked that the bishop may 'shepherd thy holy flock,' so in the prayer for the ordination of a presbyter it is asked that they may 'help and govern thy people,' and the specific gift for which petition is made is 'the Spirit of counsel.'[1] But the presbyters are also 'conjoined with the bishop in the sacerdotal office'[2] and have 'sacerdotal functions'[3] as his 'fellow-ministers'[4]: with him they form a collective priesthood. Consequently they normally 'concelebrate' with the bishop in the ministry of the sacraments. They cooperate in Baptism, receiving the renunciations of the candidate and anointing him before and after baptism; while the act of baptism is done either by the bishop or by one of the presbyters[5]. As part of the 'clerical ministry' they 'serve the altar and the sacrifices,'[6] standing with the bishop at the altar and with him laying their hands on the sacred oblation at the consecration of the Eucharist and assisting him in the communion of the people[7]. In Absolution they join with the bishop in the imposition of hands on the penitent[8]. And in Ordinations to their own order 'the presbyters also' with the bishop 'impose their hands.'[9] And this habitual and normal cooperation and concelebration with the bishop no doubt accounts for the comparative scarcity of allusion to the liturgical and sacramental functions of the presbyterate in this period. Between the more conspicuous activity of the bishop as the president and mouthpiece of the collective priesthood on the one hand, and the active, though subordinate, ministry of

[1] S. Hippol. *Order* 2: see above pp. 284, 285.
[2] S. Cyp. *Ep.* lxi 3 cum episcopo presbyteri sacerdotali honore coniuncti.
[3] Tert. *Praesc.* 41. [4] *συλλειτουργοί* Conc. Neocaes. *can.* 14.
[5] Above pp. 343 sqq. [6] S. Cyp. *Ep.* i 1.
[7] Above pp. 351 sq.: *Apostolic Church Order* 18.
[8] S. Cyp. *Epp.* xvi 2, xvii 2. [9] Below p. 400.

the diaconate on the other, the more passive and silent *rôle* of the presbyterate was obscured and made inconspicuous. It is probable that it was comparatively rare for the individual presbyter to be the celebrant of any sacrament. It was only with the extension of the Church and the enlargement of the communities, necessitating the growth of a parochial system, with the consequent impossibility of the whole church assembling in congregation with the bishop, that the collective priesthood was dispersed, and individual presbyters were put in charge of 'parishes' in and around great cities like Rome and Carthage and Alexandria[1], and there, as we shall find, each with a deacon 'to his minister,' celebrated Baptism and the Eucharist, and in some circumstances reconciled the penitent.

3. Deacons are 'ministers, not of meats and drinks,' but 'of God and Christ' and 'of the Church of God,'[2] but this, subordinately, as being the 'ministers of the episcopate.'[3] In this capacity they minister at Baptism, accompanying the catechumen, as we have seen, into the font and prompting him in his confession of faith[4]; and under some circumstances they baptize[5]. But their most distinctive ministry is at the Liturgy, where their function is four-fold. (*a*) They have charge of the doors and of the ordering and discipline of the congregation[6].

[1] For the 'Hill' parish in Carthage see S. Cyp. *Ep.* xli, Benson *Cyprian* p. 112; for Alexandria, S. Athan. *Apol. c. Arian.* 85, S. Epiph. *Haer.* lxix 1, Sozom. *H.E.* i 15. Spanish parishes with deacons as rectors are implied in Conc. Elib. *can.* 77.

[2] S. Ign. *Trall.* 2 τοὺς διακόνους ὄντας μυστηρίων Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ...οὐ γὰρ βρωμάτων καὶ ποτῶν εἰσιν διάκονοι ἀλλ' ἐκκλησίας Θεοῦ ὑπηρέται, *Magn.* 6 τῶν διακόνων...πεπιστευμένων διακονίαν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ: S. Polyc. *Phil.* 5 ὡς Θεοῦ καὶ Χριστοῦ διάκονοι.

[3] S. Hippol. *Order* 3 § 2: S. Cyp. *Ep.* iii 3 apostolos id est episcopos et praepositos Dominus elegit, diaconos autem post ascensum Domini in caelos apostoli sibi constituerunt episcopatus sui et ecclesiae ministros: Conc. Nicaen. *can.* 18 οἱ διάκονοι...τοῦ μὲν ἐπισκόπου ὑπηρέται εἰσί.

[4] Above p. 343.

[5] *Didasc.* iii 12 § 3 cum tu [the bishop] baptizas uel cum diaconis praecipis baptizare.

[6] *Ibid.* ii 57 §§ 6 sqq.

(*b*) They 'make the proclamations,' that is to say, they recite the biddings of the common prayers, and the admonitions and directions to the congregation touching their cooperation in the rite[1]. (*c*) They have a 'ministry of the altar,'[2] and like the rest of 'the clerical ministry' they too 'serve the altar and the sacrifices.'[3] The Hippolytean prayer for the ordination of deacons describes them as elected 'to minister to thy Church and to bring to the holy sanctuary the things that are to be offered by thy chosen highpriests to the glory of thy name,'[4] that is, they receive the offerings of the people[5] and set forth on the altar the selected oblations of the Eucharist[6]; and they 'stand by the oblations' during the Prayer of Consecration[7]. And (*d*) at the communion, they communicate the people, in earlier days in both species, but later administering only the chalice[8].

4. Of the Minor Orders, the Reader is the oldest; and in the East no other appears in the ante-Nicene period[9], except the Subdeacon in Syria and Asia Minor near the end of the period[10]. In Africa too only the Reader occurs before the middle of the third century[11].

[1] Conc. Ancyr. *can.* 2 *τῆς ἱερᾶς λειτουργίας τῆς τοῦ...κηρύσσειν* (*κηρύσσειν*, *προσφωνεῖν*, are the technical words for this function of the diaconate). Cp. *Didasc.* ii 54 § 1 *ὁ διάκονος μετὰ ὑψηλῆς φωνῆς λεγέτω Μή τις κατά τινος.*

[2] S. Cyp. *Ep.* lxvii 4. [3] *Ibid.* i 1.

[4] The text of this clause of the prayer (*Order* 3 § 8) may be restored thus: *ὃν ἐξελέξω διακονεῖν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ σου καὶ προσάγειν τῷ ἁγίῳ σου ἁγιάσματι τὰ παρὰ τῶν κληρωθέντων σου ἀρχιερέων προσφερόμενά σοι.* In the prayer for the ordination of deacons in all rites, if any specific function of the order is alluded to, it is always this ministry of the altar.

[5] *Didasc.* ii 27 § 3.

[6] Conc. Ancyr. *can.* 2 *τῆς ἱερᾶς λειτουργίας τῆς τοῦ ἄρτον ἢ ποτήριον ἀναφέρειν.*

[7] *Didasc.* ii 57 § 6.

[8] S. Justin M. *Apol.* i 65, 67: S. Cyp. *de Laps.* 25.

[9] *Apost. Ch. Order* 15: *Didasc.* ii 28 § 5.

[10] *Didasc.* ii 34 § 3: and the *ὑπηρέτης* of Conc. Neocaes. *can.* 10 is the subdeacon: cp. Conc. Laodic. *can.* 20—22, 24 sq.: *Ap. Const.* iii 11 § 1, vi 17 § 2.

[11] Tert. *Praesc.* 41.

In the days of Hippolytus the Roman Church had Subdeacons and Readers[1]; and by the middle of the century the whole list had been completed by the addition of Acolytes, Exorcists, and Doorkeepers[2]; while in Africa at the same date all the orders appear except the Doorkeepers[3]. Of these Orders, those of the Subdeacon and the Acolyte were developements of the Diaconate, relieving the deacon of some of his lower administrative functions, and in this period they had no office in the worship of the basilica. Of the rest, the Doorkeepers evidently took over the custody of the doors. The Exorcists presumably administered the exorcism of the Catechumens in the last period of their catechumenate[4]. The office of the Reader was to recite from the pulpit the Lessons and the Gospel at the Mass of the Catechumens[5].

II

It appears then that the Bishop was competent in respect of the ministration of all the Sacraments, and was the normal celebrant of them. At the same time, the Presbyters were 'conjoined with the bishop in the sacerdotal office,' forming a sacerdotal college which cooperated in sacramental action, with the bishop as its president, highpriest, and mouthpiece. This was the general usage so long as the conditions lasted which made it possible; but as conditions were changed, through the enlargement of the Church, this collective priesthood became dispersed and locally distributed, and individual presbyters acted in relative independence. The Deacons, as ministers of the bishop, discharged the subordinate and the more mechanical functions incidental to the ministry of the sacraments; while the

[1] *Order* 5, 6. [2] S. Cornelius ap. Eus. *H.E.* vi 43 § 11.
[3] S. Cyp. *Epp.* ix 1, xxiii, xxix, lii § 1.
[4] Above p. 341. [5] S. Cyp. *Epp.* xxxviii 2, xxxix 4.

Readers, the Exorcists, and the Doorkeepers, discharged the several functions implied in their titles.

We may now observe the situation from a different point of view, and consider the administration of the sacraments in succession, in order to confirm the results already reached, and to determine the limits, if any, which were set to the competence of the presbyterate and the degree of the independence which it came to enjoy; and further, to ascertain in what cases, if in any, the authority to minister the sacraments belonged, or could be extended, to anyone who was not included in the priesthood, that is, who was neither bishop nor presbyter.

1. In the *de Baptismo* of Tertullian, written for the instruction of catechumens, we possess, what is unique in the ante-Nicene period, viz. a treatise on a Sacrament; and among other things the tractate supplies, what is also unique, an explicit statement concerning the minister of Baptism, an answer in detail (which appears to represent the conception which prevailed universally) to the question who is and who is not competent to administer the sacrament.

(*a*) According to Tertullian, then, the Bishop is the normal minister of Baptism. 'The right of conferring' baptism 'belongs to the highpriest, that is, the Bishop.'[1] As we have already noted, this is confirmed some half a century later by S. Firmilian: 'The authority to remit sins' by baptism 'was given to the apostles and to the churches which they, sent by Christ, established, and to the bishops who succeeded them by ordination in their stead'[2]; and that the bishop is the normal minister is perhaps everywhere implied, where explicit allusion is made to the minister of baptism, from Ignatius onwards.

[1] Tert. *de Bapt.* 17 dandi quidem habet ius summus sacerdos, qui est episcopus.

[2] Above p. 381 note 2.

(*b*) But already S. Ignatius implies that the bishop can and does authorize others to baptize. 'It is not lawful to baptize apart from the bishop...but whatsoever he approves, this is well pleasing also to God, that all that ye do may be secure and valid.'[1] How far the bishop's discretion extends in respect of the orders or persons to whom his licence may be given, Ignatius leaves undefined: but Tertullian continues: 'In the second place presbyters and deacons' possess the right, 'yet not without the bishop's authorization, for the sake of the honour of the Church; since, when this is preserved, peace is preserved.'[2] Presbyters and deacons, then, are competent to minister; but the exercise of their authority is limited in order to guard against schism. In practice, presbyters and deacons are found baptizing by the bishop's authorization in three several situations. First, in the regular administration, while the bishop presides and consecrates the water and the oils, the presbyters and deacons cooperate[3], and the act of baptism, that is the formal application of the water and the recitation of the formula, is effected either by the bishop himself, or at his direction by a presbyter or a deacon[4]. Secondly, this direction or licence becomes permanent when a presbyter or a deacon is put in charge of a 'parish' and becomes an ordinary

[1] S. Ignat. *Smyrn.* 8 *μηδεὶς χωρὶς ἐπισκόπου τι πρασσέτω τῶν ἀνηκόντων εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν...οὐκ ἐξόν ἐστιν χωρὶς τοῦ ἐπισκόπου...βαπτίζειν ...ἀλλ' ὃ ἂν ἐκεῖνος δοκιμάσῃ τοῦτο καὶ τῷ Θεῷ εὐάρεστον, ἵνα ἀσφαλὲς ᾖ καὶ βέβαιον πᾶν ὃ πράσσετε.*

[2] Tert. *de Bapt.* 17 dehinc presbyteri et diaconi, non tamen sine episcopi auctoritate, propter ecclesiae honorem, quo saluo salua pax est.

[3] Cp. Origen *hom.* iv *in Ies. Nav.* 1 si uero ad mysticum baptismi ueneris fontem et consistente sacerdotali et leuitico ordine initiatus fueris uenerandis illis magnificisque sacramentis, quae norunt illi quos nosse fas est, tunc etiam sacerdotum ministeriis Iordane digresso terram repromissionis intrabis.

[4] Above pp. 343 sq.: *Didasc.* iii 12 § 3 cum tu baptizas uel cum diaconis praecipis baptizare uel presbyteris (but perhaps this refers to baptisms without the bishop's presence). Cp. Acts x 48, xix 5, 1 Cor. i 14 sqq.

minister of baptism[1]. And thirdly, the licence is understood to be given implicitly in all cases of necessity, when, that is, the subject of baptism is in danger of death[2].

(*c*) 'Moreover the right' to baptize 'belongs also to laymen.'[3] Tertullian bases this right on the broadest grounds: what all have equally received, all may equally give; the authority to baptize was given to the 'disciples' at large; and, as the Word of God is necessary for all, so is baptism. But the order and peace of the Church requires that laymen should not exercise the right except 'in cases of necessity' and when the subject 'is in danger.' And this was the general rule. Towards the end of the period, the Council of Eliberis directs a layman to baptize a catechumen in danger of death, if the ordinary procedure is impossible, provided that he has himself kept his baptism intact, i.e. that he has not apostatized, or perhaps has not been put to penance, and that he be not a digamist, i.e. a remarried widower —a touch of Spanish rigourism[4].

(*d*) Tertullian adds a characteristically vehement repudiation of baptism by women. Elsewhere he says, with more self-restraint, that 'it is not allowed to a woman to speak in church, nor yet to baptize or offer nor to claim a share in any work of men, to say nothing of the sacerdotal office'; while in his indictment of heretical discipline the climax of the 'wantonness' of their ladies is that 'they are bold enough perhaps even to baptize.'[5] And this was not mere Tertullianism; for

[1] Conc. Elib. *can.* 77.

[2] *de Rebaptismate* 10 si a minore clero [sc. presbyter or deacon] per necessitatem traditum fuerit [baptisma].

[3] Tert. *de Bapt.* 17 alioquin etiam laicis ius est.

[4] Conc. Elib. *can.* 38 loco peregre nauigantes aut si ecclesia in proximo non fuerit, posse fidelem, qui lauacrum suum integrum habet nec sit bigamus, baptizare in necessitate infirmitatis positum catechumenum.

[5] Tert. *de Virg. Veland.* 9 non permittitur mulieri in ecclesia loqui sed nec docere nec tinguere nec offerre nec ullius uirilis muneris, nedum

the same prohibition is found in the East[1]. In fact it was not till some centuries later that baptism by women in cases of necessity was recognized.

2. The minister of Confirmation is exclusively the Bishop. In the Baptismal rite of the Hippolytean *Order*, the only function, other than the consecration of the water and the oils, which is assigned to the bishop without alternative, is the Confirmation of the neophyte[2]; while in the *Didascalia*, where it is provided that in the baptism of women the body be anointed by the deaconesses, the unction on the head and the imposition of the hand is expressly reserved to the bishop[3]. And when baptism is contemplated as administered without the bishop's presence, it is always recognized that the neophyte must, if possible, be brought to the bishop to be 'perfected by his blessing,' that is to say, that by the bishop's prayer and the imposition of his hand he may receive the Holy Ghost and the Seal of the Lord[4]. And, in fact, whenever the minister of Confirmation is expressly indicated, he is always the bishop[5].

sacerdotalis officii sortem sibi uindicare: *Praesc.* 41 ipsae mulieres haereticae quam procaces! quae audeant docere, contendere, exorcismos agere, curationes repromittere, forsitan et tinguere.

[1] *Didasc.* iii 9.

[2] Above p. 349.

[3] *Didasc.* iii 12 § 2.

[4] S. Cyp. *Ep.* lxxiii 9: *de Rebaptismate* 4, 10: Eus. *H.E.* vi 43 § 15.

[5] To the above references add *Sentt. epp.* 1: S. Firmilian ap. S. Cyp. *Ep.* lxxv 7: *Didasc.* ii 32 sq.: Conc. Elib. *can.* 38, 77. Yet Tertullian in the *de Baptismo*, in which he treats of Baptism in the large sense, as including Confirmation, marks no distinction between the minister of Baptism proper and that of the Imposition of Hands. But perhaps in discussing the minister (17) he is thinking only of Baptism proper and in respect of Confirmation is to be interpreted in accordance with all the other evidence. It should be added that in Egypt, after the middle of the 4th century, a presbyter, in the absence of the bishop, 'consigned' the neophyte (Ambrosiaster *Quaestiones V. et N. Testamenti* ci, *in Eph.* iv 12), but with chrism consecrated by the bishop (S. Didymus *de Trin.* ii 15); and it is possible that this was already practised in the East in our period. It is the present universal practice of the East; and in the West it was allowed by S. Gregory the Great in Sardinia (*Ep.* iv 26);

3. At the end of the first century, the ministers of the Eucharist were, or at least included, the 'bishops.' Whatever was the precise nature of the 'episcopate' of S. Clement's *Epistle to the Corinthians* and its relation to the presbyterate generally, its distinctive office in 'ministering to the flock of Christ' was 'to offer the oblations.'[1] So in the *Didache*: its 'bishops' are 'appointed' with a view to the Breaking of the Bread and the Eucharist: and they 'minister the ministry of the prophets,' who themselves 'gave thanks.'[2] In S. Justin Martyr's description of the Liturgy in the middle of the second century, the celebrant is 'the president.' In writing to outsiders, Justin naturally avoids technicalities and uses a title which would be generally intelligible to his readers. But the 'president' is contrasted with the reader and the deacons, and it may be assumed that he was either bishop or presbyter[3]. When statements or allusions are more explicit, the minister of the Eucharist is always either bishop or presbyter. For example, S. Ignatius implies that the bishop is the normal celebrant[4]. When S. Polycarp was in Rome, the pope Anicetus, 'out of reverence,' 'yielded him the Eucharist,' that is to say, he invited him to take his place at the altar[5]; and in the next century, in Syria, the *Didascalia* directs that the bishop shall pay this courtesy to any bishop who visits his

while at this moment the abbots of Monte Cassino and La Cava, who are presbyters, so administer Confirmation in the dioceses which they respectively govern.

[1] S. Clem. Rom. *ad Cor.* 44. The Archbishop of Dublin (*Studia sacra*, London 1917, pp. 285 sqq.; cp. his *Pastoral Epistles*, Cambridge 1899, pp. lxii sqq.) has pointed out that S. Clement's episcopate and presbyterate were not conterminous, and that the ministry of worship (λειτουργία) belonged distinctively to the former.

[2] *Didache* 14 sq., 10.

[3] S. Justin M. *Apol.* i 65, 67: προεστώς is of course a quite ordinary title of a bishop: e.g. S. Hippol. *in Dan.* iii 18 sq. Cp. Tertullian's *praesidens* (*de Cor. Mil.* 3) and S. Cyprian's *praepositus* (*Epp.* xxxiii 1, lxxiii 9).

[4] S. Ignat. *Smyrn.* 8.

[5] S. Iren. ap. Eus. *H.E.* v 24 § 17.

church[1]. S. Cyprian tells the story of an incident which occurred while he was himself celebrating[2]; and at the Carthaginian Council of 256, Caecilius of Biltha in his vehement repudiation of heretical baptisms, denouncing heretical ministrations in general, finds it the worst outrage of all that they involve that the heretic bishop, the *antistes diaboli*, dares 'to make the Eucharist.'[3]

But while the bishop is the normal minister, Ignatius recognizes that he may, and does, entrust the celebration of the Eucharist to others[4]. And while, for reasons already indicated, mention of presbyteral ministrations is comparatively rare in this period, they are not altogether wanting, especially in the first quarter of the 4th century. In the correspondence of S. Cyprian we more than once hear of individual presbyters celebrating the Eucharist, each having a deacon attached to him as his minister[5]. And in the canons of the Councils of the early years of the next century, it is recognized as a commonplace that presbyters 'have the authority to offer,'[6] and, in fact, that this is their highest and characteristic prerogative and that of which they are first deprived if they are found guilty of grave offences[7]. The title 'priest' (ἱερεύς, *sacerdos*) was no doubt adopted as the correlative of the altar and the sacrifice; and, as such, it generally denotes the bishop as the normal minister of the altar. But the presbyters, as we have seen, were 'conjoined with the bishop in the sacerdotal office' and have 'sacerdotal functions'; and in fact they are sometimes, if rarely in this period, called 'priests.'[8]

[1] *Didasc.* ii 58 § 3. [2] *de Lapsis* 25. [3] *Sentt. epp.* 1.

[4] S. Ignat. *Smyrn.* 8 ἐκείνη βεβαία εὐχαριστία ἡγείσθω ἡ ὑπὸ τὸν ἐπίσκοπον οὖσα ἢ ᾧ ἂν αὐτὸς ἐπιτρέψῃ...οὐκ ἐξόν ἐστιν χωρὶς τοῦ ἐπισκόπου οὔτε βαπτίζειν οὔτε ἀγάπην ποιεῖν.

[5] S. Cyp. *Epp.* v 2, xxxiv 1.

[6] Conc. Ancyr. *can.* 1, Neocaes. *can.* 9, Nicaen. *can.* 18.

[7] Conc. Ancyr. *can.* 1, Neocaes. *can.* 9.

[8] Tertullian appears commonly to use *sacerdos* of the presbyter (see above pp. 221—223); Hippolytus *Order* 3 § 2 attributes the *sacerdotium* to presbyters; for Origen the presbyter is *inferior sacerdos* as contrasted

Consequently, in some instances, it may be difficult to say, when the 'priest' is spoken of as the minister of the Eucharist, whether the bishop alone is meant or the presbyter is included: as, for example, when Tertullian jeers at the twice-married man, who on the *obit* of his first wife 'offers' for both his wives 'through' a once-married or celibate 'priest.'[1] But however this may be, it is clear that both the bishop and the presbyter were proper ministers of the Eucharist.

On the other hand, though Deacons 'served the altar and the sacrifices,' their 'ministry of the altar' was of quite another sort[2]. The Nicene Council, as it assumes that presbyters have the authority to offer, equally treats it as a commonplace that deacons have not[3]. It is true that ten years earlier, the fathers at Arles had learned that 'in many places deacons are offering.'[4] This assumption of the sacerdotal office was perhaps an instance of the ambition of the diaconate to assert a precedence over the presbyterate, which was repressed in other instances by the Nicene Council[5], but continued to be a marked characteristic of the order in the next century and aroused the criticism of the author of the *Quaestiones* and the wrath of S. Jerome[6]. Or perhaps it was only a blunder on the part of deacons who found themselves in a new and unfamiliar situation as 'rectors' of outlying congregations[7]. In any case, the assumption only comes to light to be repudiated, and the Council enacts that what has come to their knowledge 'ought by no means to happen.'

with the bishops *qui populis praesunt* (*hom.* xi *in Exod.* 6); and S. Cyprian, besides regarding the presbyters as *cum episcopo sacerdotali honore coniuncti* (*Ep.* lxi 3), once uses *sacerdotes* of presbyters (*Ep.* xl).

[1] Tert. *de Exhort. Cast.* 11.
[2] See above p. 388.
[3] Conc. Nicaen. *can.* 18 τοὺς ἐξουσίαν μὴ ἔχοντας προσφέρειν.
[4] Conc. Arelat. i *can.* 15.
[5] Conc. Nicaen. *can.* 18.
[6] Ambrosiaster *Quaest. V. et N. T.* ci: S. Jerome *Ep.* cxlvi.
[7] Conc. Elib. *can.* 77.

If deacons had no authority to offer, *a fortiori* it was out of the question for minor clerks or laymen 'to make the Eucharist.'[1]

4. All the evidence we have points to the Bishop as the normal minister of Absolution; and for the most part the evidence does not suggest that any other than the bishop had any competence in this respect or took any part in the administration, except by way of judging of the penitent's conversion and consenting to his reconciliation. The earliest remaining explicit reference to the minister of Absolution is found in the *de Pudicitia*, where Tertullian, while himself holding that 'the greater and irremissible offences' are reserved 'to God only,' acknowledges that 'for the lighter offences after baptism penitence can gain pardon from the bishop.'[2] The author of *de Aleatoribus* opens his tractate by reminding his readers that 'the divine loving-kindness of the Father has conferred' on the episcopate 'the apostolic leadership and the throne in the Lord's stead' and with it 'the authority to loose and to bind and by healing care to remit sins'[3]; and Caecilius of Biltha's protest against the heretical bishop includes the count that 'the impa-

[1] But see Tert. *de Exhortatione Castitatis* 7. In arguing against the lawfulness of second marriages, Tertullian anticipates the plea, that the fact that such marriages are forbidden to priests implies that they are lawful for laymen. His reply is that laymen are subject to the same discipline as priests, because they also are priests (Apoc. i 6) and in some circumstances exercise the common priesthood by baptizing and offering. 'Adeo ubi ecclesiastici ordinis non est consessus et offers et tinguis et sacerdos es tibi solus. Sed ubi tres, ecclesia est, licet laici.... Igitur si habes ius sacerdotis in temetipso ubi necesse est, habeas oportet etiam disciplinam sacerdotis.' Tertullian therefore has in view a case of necessity, that of isolated Christians, where the ordinary resources of the Church are not available. Some answer must have been given to the question of what is to be done in such cases; and, though Tertullian writing as a Montanist may be over-emphatic in favour of one answer, his answer is obviously a possible one.

[2] Tert. *de Pudicit.* 18 salua illa paenitentiae specie post fidem quae aut leuioribus delictis ueniam ab episcopo consequi poterit, aut maioribus et irremissibilibus a Deo solo. For the character of the *leuiora* see *ibid.* 7.

[3] *de Aleat.* 1.

cific gives peace.'[1] In the East Origen, the *Didascalia*, and the Clementines, alike relate the authority to bind and loose only to the bishop. Origen, for example, while holding with others of his day that the unworthiness of the minister prejudices the effect of the sacrament, recognizes that the bishops have inherited the prerogative of Peter and 'received from the Saviour the keys of the kingdom of heaven,' and consequently that they are sound in their 'teaching that what is bound, that is, condemned, by them is bound also in heaven, and that what receives remission from them is loosed also in heaven,' provided they have the practical qualification which won for the apostle the promise, '*Thou art Peter.*'[2]

But, in fact, the ministry of reconciliation was not confined to bishops. (*a*) In Rome and Africa, if not elsewhere, the *clerus*, i.e. the presbyters and deacons, cooperated with the bishop in the imposition of hands with which the penitent was absolved[3]. (*b*) Presbyters were commissioned to receive the *exomologesis* of dying penitents, to reconcile them by imposition of hands, and to communicate them[4]. (*c*) And by a commission given by the bishops in view of a special case of emergency or of a special class of such cases, deacons were authorized to reconcile the dying with the same procedure[5]. (*d*) For a while, the authority of remission was recognized as belonging also to the martyrs, that is to say, to the con-

[1] *Sentt. epp.* 1.

[2] Origen *in Mat.* xii 14 ἐπεὶ δὲ οἱ τὸν τόπον τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς ἐκδικοῦντες χρῶνται τῷ ῥητῷ, ὡς Πέτρος, καὶ τὰς κλεῖδας τῆς τῶν οὐρανῶν βασιλείας ἀπὸ τοῦ Σωτῆρος εἰληφότες, διδάσκουσί τε τὰ ὑπ' αὐτῶν δεδεμένα, τουτέστι καταδεδικασμένα, καὶ ἐν οὐρανοῖς δέδεσθαι, καὶ τὰ ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἄφεσιν εἰληφότα καὶ ἐν οὐρανοῖς λέλυσθαι, λεκτέον ὅτι ὑγιῶς λέγουσιν εἰ ἔχοιεν ἔργον δι' ὃ εἴρηται ἐκείνῳ τῷ Πέτρῳ Σὺ εἶ Πέτρος. Cp. *Didasc.* ii *passim*: *Ep. Clem. ad Iac.* 2, 6, *Clem. Hom.* iii 72.

[3] S. Cyp. *Ep.* xvi 2.

[4] *Ibid.* xix 2: Conc. Elib. *can.* 32: but in the East the presbyter did not perhaps need any special commission to act, Conc. Neocaes. *can.* 7.

[5] S. Cyp. *Ep.* xviii 1: Conc. Elib. *can.* 32.

fessors imprisoned for the Faith. In his address *To the Martyrs* in 197, Tertullian notes it as 'customary' for offenders who were deprived of the peace of the Church to recover communion by petitioning the martyrs in prison[1]; and twenty years later, it is one of the counts of his indictment of the penitential policy of Callistus of Rome that the pope definitely extends to the martyrs the authority to remit those sins which Tertullian regards as irremissible[2]. If this is a true account of the attitude of the Roman Church under Callistus, that attitude had been changed by the middle of the century, and at the time of the Decian persecution 'the prerogative of the martyrs'[3] was no longer recognized and the claim was no longer made for them[4]. In Africa, on the other hand, during the same crisis, this prerogative was asserted with a troublesome emphasis. The martyrs issued certificates (*libelli*) to individuals and to groups of *lapsi*, requiring their restoration, and some presbyters treated these certificates as absolutions and proceeded forthwith to communicate the holders of them. S. Cyprian disallowed this from the outset. In his *interim* programme of procedure, he refused to recognize the martyrs' certificates as absolutions and forbade the *lapsi* to be communicated merely on the basis of the *libelli* and without previous penance and absolution. He only allowed to the martyrs the right of intercession on behalf of the *lapsi*; their certificates were to be regarded only as testimonials to character; and even so they were to be carefully examined by the Church before being accepted. The only concession he was willing to make, pending the cessation of the persecution and the settle-

[1] Tert. *ad Martyras* 1 quam pacem quidam in ecclesia non habentes a martyribus in carcere exorare consueuerunt. I am unable to see, with Dr Benson (*Cyprian* p. 89), that Tertullian here 'intimates a doubt of the validity of this system.'

[2] Tert. *de Pudic.* 22 at tu iam et in martyras tuos effundis hanc potestatem.

[3] S. Cyp. *Ep.* xviii 1.

[4] ap. S. Cyp. *Ep.* xxxvi 2.

ment of a general policy, was to allow an individual *lapsus* who held a certificate to be reconciled *in extremis*[1]. And when such a general policy was fixed by the Carthaginian Council of 251, the *praerogatiua martyrum* was ignored[2]; and henceforth little more is heard of it[3].

5. The minister of Ordination is the Bishop. On this point, while, on the one hand, express allusions to the minister of ordination, as distinguished from allusions to ordination in general, happen to be comparatively rare, on the other hand the information supplied by the Hippolytean *Order* is exceptionally full both in practical and in theoretical detail.

The Hippolytean form of the consecration of a bishop, as we have already seen, recognizes it as one of his functions 'to confer orders.'[4] And similarly, in the East, S. Firmilian incidentally notices that it is those whom he calls, sometimes, in old-fashioned language, 'elders' or 'elders and provosts,' sometimes 'bishops' 'the successors of the apostles,' who 'possess the authority to ordain.'[5]

In the exercise of this authority, after election by the whole people of a vacant see, the new Bishop is consecrated with the imposition of the hands of 'the bishops who are present' and the further imposition of the hand of one of them who is chosen to recite the prayer of consecration[6].

A Presbyter is ordained by the Bishop, who imposes his hand and recites the prayer of ordination, the existing presbyters joining with him in the imposition of hands. This cooperation, it is explained, does not import that the presbyters have authority to ordain: they impose their hands because they share the 'common Spirit' who

[1] S. Cyp. *Epp.* xv—xx, xxiii, xxvi sq., xxxiii. [2] *Ibid.* lv 6, 17, 23.
[3] See Benson *Cyprian* p. 95 n. 2.
[4] Above p. 381. [5] Above p. 381 n. 2.
[6] *Order* 1.

is invoked upon the ordinand, and thereby they set their seal to the act of the ordaining bishop[1].

A Deacon is ordained, after election, by the Bishop alone, without the cooperation of the presbyterate; and this, because the deacon is not ordained to the priesthood and has no place in the council of the presbyters, nor receives 'the Spirit of the presbyter,' but is only the minister of the bishop, acting under his orders and reporting to him[2].

The Minor Orders are appointed by the Bishop, the Reader by the delivery of the Book of the Apostle, the Subdeacon by nomination, without imposition of hands or prayer in either case[3].

This then is the account of the ministry of Ordination set out in the Hippolytean document. And since the other, fragmentary, records of the period, so far as they go, are in agreement with it[4], and since also the procedure so described is the procedure which is found prevailing everywhere later on, it is natural to assume that the *Order* represents, not only the Roman practice and theory of the third century, but that of the Church at large. It is true that there are instances of ordinations in this period which, it has been supposed, were conferred by presbyters; but these supposed instances appear to be based either upon misinterpretation or upon reports which are doubtful in point of fact.

[1] *Order* 2. [2] *Order* 3.

[3] *Order* 5 sq. The 'Book of the Apostle' is the Epistles of S. Paul. (For this use of 'the Apostle' see S. Hippol. *Philosoph.* vii 38: Eus. *H.E.* vi 38 [Origen], iii 27 § 4, and probably v 17 § 4, 18 § 5.) If this, the Sahidic text, represents the original, it follows that in Rome the reading of the Gospel was not assigned to the Reader, as it was in Africa (above p. 389 n. 5): the Ethiopic has 'the Scripture,' the Arabic 'the Book.'

[4] Election and ordination of Bishops, Eus. *H.E.* vi 11 § 2, 29 § 3: Origen *hom.* xxii *in Num.* 4: *de Aleatoribus* 3: S. Cyp. *Epp.* lv 8, lix 5, lxvii 3—5, lxviii 2: Cornelius ap. Eus. *H.E.* vi 43 §§ 8 sq.: *Didasc.* ii 2 § 3: *Ep. Clem. ad Iac.* 19, *Clem. Hom.* iii 72: Conc. Arelat. i *can.* 20, Nicaen. *can.* 4, 8, *ep.* ap. Socr. *H.E.* i 9; of Presbyters Eus. *H.E.* vi 23 § 4: Cornelius ap. Eus. *H.E.* vi 43 § 17: Conc. Ancyr. *can.* 13, Nicaen. *can.* 9, 16.

What needs to be said of them can be dismissed to a note[1].

[1] (1) It has often been asserted on the supposed authority of S. Cyprian (*Ep.* lii 2) that the presbyter Novatus ordained Felicissimus deacon. (*a*) It is true that Cyprian says of Novatus 'diaconum fecerat' at Carthage; but he adds that he also 'episcopum fecit' at Rome; and, as we know, he did the latter by getting Novatian elected by a clique and suborning three rustic bishops to consecrate him (Cornelius ap. Eus. *H.E.* vi 43 §§ 7 sqq.). Similarly Cyprian says of himself that he was 'made' bishop by his own *plebs* (*Ep.* xliii 4). But (*b*) this is really irrelevant, and S. Cyprian makes his meaning quite clear in the context, where he says that Novatus 'Felicissimum satellitem suum suum diaconum, nec permittente me nec sciente, sua factione et ambitione constituit,' i.e. he appointed Felicissimus, who was obviously already a deacon, to be *his own* deacon, his assistant in the administration of his Hill parish, without the licence or knowledge of his bishop.

(2) Of the 13th canon of Ancyra—Χωρεπισκόπους μὴ ἐξεῖναι πρεσβυτέρους ἢ διακόνους χειροτονεῖν, ἀλλὰ μὴν μηδὲ πρεσβυτέρους πόλεως, χωρὶς τοῦ ἐπιτραπῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου μετὰ γραμμάτων ἐν ἑκάστῃ παροικίᾳ—the second clause appears to imply that city-presbyters with the written permission of the bishop might ordain. But ἀλλὰ μὴν μηδέ = 'nor yet even' is puzzling, since it implies, not only that city-presbyters could ordain, but that they might claim to do so on their own account with more plausibility than 'suffragan'-bishops could; which on any showing seems absurd. Mr Turner suggests to me a solution of the puzzle; viz. that originally the text read ἀλλὰ μὴν μηδὲ πόλεως, ἐπισκόπους being understood from χωρεπισκόπους above, and that a copyist, not quite understanding the canon, inserted πρεσβυτέρους, meaning it to be parallel to πρεσβυτέρους ἢ διακόνους. If so, the canon is quite simple and only enforces a universal principle of ecclesiastical organization; viz. that without the written commission of the bishop neither his 'suffragans' nor yet even city-bishops, i.e. bishops of other sees, may ordain in his diocese.

(3) S. Jerome (*Ep.* cxlvi § 1) relates what appears to mean that, from the first 'down to the episcopates of Heraclas and Dionysius, the presbyters' of Alexandria 'always elected one of their own number,' enthroned him, 'and called him bishop' without consecration; 'just like, say, an army electing an Emperor, or deacons choosing one of themselves...and calling him archdeacon.' It is impossible here to discuss this story at length, and it must suffice to say (*a*) that Jerome's account of what happened 150 years before finds no confirmation in the writings of Origen, who was contemporary with the supposed revolution, nor in the *History* of Eusebius; and (*b*) it has been suggested by Mr Turner (*Cambridge Medieval History* i pp. 160 sq.) that the whole story is only an echo of the demonstrably false report circulated by the Arian party that Athanasius himself had been consecrated only by presbyters. See further the forthcoming edition of the Bishop of Oxford's *The Church and the Ministry* pp. 128—137.

(4) It has been suggested that the ordination of Ischyras by Colluthus

6. The relation of the Church to Marriage was already in the ante-Nicene period practically what it is

in the second decade of the fourth century is another indication of the survival in Egypt of an older rule which allowed presbyters to ordain. Ischyras had set up a conventicle in a house somewhere in the Mareotis, claiming to be a presbyter (S. Athan. *Apol. c. Arian.* 11). At first it was supposed that he had been ordained in the Meletian sect, but this was disproved by the evidence of two ex-Meletian presbyters (*ib.* 46: cp. 11, 28). Then it was inferred (*ib.* 11) or ascertained (*ib.* 76) that he had been ordained by Colluthus, a presbyter of Alexandria, who had made a schism; and consequently his ordination was repudiated by the whole Egyptian episcopate (*ib.* 12) and by the clergy of the Mareotis (*ib.* 76); in fact nobody at all believed him to be a presbyter except his own relations, the seven persons who formed his congregation (*ib.* 74, 77, 84). But it is not at all certain that Colluthus even claimed to ordain *qua* presbyter. According to the Mareotic clergy 'he affected the rôle of the episcopate' (*ib.* 76 *φανταsθέντος ἐπισκοπήν*), and this may mean, not only that by the fact of ordaining he played the bishop, but that he had actually been consecrated by Meletian bishops. And the same may be implied by the Egyptian bishops when they say (*ib.* 12): 'But that Colluthus died a presbyter'—i.e., in accordance with the idea of the time, he was held to be no bishop because he had been consecrated in schism—'and every ordination of his was nullified and all that were ordained by him *in the schism* have turned out to be laymen and are now in communion only in that status, is plain and nobody doubts it'—i.e., even if his own consecration had been good, yet his ordinations were null because conferred in schism. And in fact, on returning to the Church, Colluthus was reconciled as a presbyter, Ischyras as a layman (*ib.* 76, 74).

(5) It has been contended (Hatch *Organization of the early Christian Churches*[2] p. 133) that in the third century consecration was not regarded as necessary for bishops, because S. Cyprian in dealing with the case of S. Cornelius details the facts of his election and says nothing of his consecration. In point of fact this is untrue; for while Cyprian says (*Ep.* lv 8) that Cornelius was 'made bishop' 'de clericorum...testimonio, de plebis ...suffragio, de sacerdotum...collegio,' he also says that he was 'made bishop' 'a plurimis collegis nostris,' that is obviously by the imposition of their hands (see *Ep.* lxvii 5). But it is more to the point to note that the question about Cornelius was not whether he was a bishop—nobody disputed that—but whether or not he was bishop *of Rome*, and that depended, not in the least on his consecration, but on his election; whether, that is, he was elected by the Roman Church and his election was confirmed by the neighbouring bishops. In Cyprian's reference to his consecration the emphasis is on *plurimis*, as evidence of the solidity of his confirmation, in contrast with Novatian who was not confirmed at all, since his three consecrators, the only bishops who intervened, were imported from some remote corner of Italy and acted in ignorance and under constraint (Eus. *H.E.* vi 43 §§ 8 sq.).

to-day. While of course, to use modern language, the contracting parties were themselves the ministers of the sacrament of marriage, the Church intervened at two points in the procedure: first, to witness and approve the terms of the contract: and secondly, to consecrate and ratify the marriage. Tertullian exclaims: 'How can we sufficiently declare the happiness of the marriage which the Church brings about and the Oblation confirms and the Blessing seals!'[1] By the Church 'bringing about' (*conciliat*) the marriage we must no doubt understand either that the Church was present by representation at the Betrothal, when the contract was formally arranged and drawn up in writing, the dowry was settled and the ring delivered as a pledge, or that the Betrothal was effected *in facie ecclesiae*. Already at the beginning of the second century S. Ignatius had reminded S. Polycarp that 'men and women who are marrying ought to contract their union with the knowledge and approval of the bishop, in order that their marriage may be according to the Lord'; and later on Tertullian describes a Christian marriage as 'demanded' from the congregation of the Church[2]. The purpose then of the intervention of the

[1] Tert. *ad Uxor.* ii 9 unde sufficiamus ad enarrandam felicitatem eius matrimonii quod ecclesia conciliat et confirmat oblatio et obsignat benedictio.

[2] S. Ignat. *Polyc.* 5 § 2 πρέπει δὲ τοῖς γαμοῦσι καὶ ταῖς γαμούσαις μετὰ γνώμης τοῦ ἐπισκόπου τὴν ἕνωσιν ποιεῖσθαι ἵνα ὁ γάμος ᾖ κατὰ Κύριον καὶ μὴ κατ' ἐπιθυμίαν: Tert. *de Monogamia* 11 ut igitur in Deo nubas secundum legem et apostolum (si tamen uel hoc curas), qualis es id matrimonium postulans, quod eis a quibus postulas non licet habere, ab episcopo monogamo, a presbyteris et diaconis eiusdem sacramenti, a uiduis quarum sectam in te recusasti? (i.e. from a congregation of which these members were necessarily but once married). Tertullian's Montanists were especially strict in this respect: *de Pudicit.* 4 penes nos occultae quoque coniunctiones, id est non prius apud ecclesiam professae, iuxta moechiam et fornicationem iudicari periclitantur. For the dowry (*dotes*) see Tert. *ad Uxor.* i 4, *de Pudicit.* 1; the written contract (*tabulae nuptiales*), *ad Uxor.* i 1, ii 3, *de Pudicit.* 1; the ring, *Apol.* 6, *de Idol.* 16; the joining of hands and the kiss, *de Virg. Vel.* 11; the bridal veil, *ibid.* Tertullian repudiates the use of the bridal wreath, *de Cor. Mil.* 13.

Church at the Betrothal was to secure that the marriage was a Christian one, and to disclaim a marriage which was not 'in the Lord.'[1] In the first three centuries no doubt the consent of the Church was given or withheld in accordance with 'the Rule of the Church,' the traditional common law; but in the first quarter of the fourth century, as in other matters, so here the rule was beginning to be reduced to writing by conciliar legislation, and marriages which were not 'in the Lord' to be formally defined as including those contracted with pagans, Jews, and heretics, or between persons related within certain degrees of affinity[2]. The Betrothal effected, the marriage, after a due interval in accordance with current secular practice, was consecrated by the Oblation of the Eucharist and the communion of the parties, by which the sacrifices of the pagan religious form of matrimony were replaced, and was finally 'sealed' by the blessing of the bishop or the presbyter, a rite perhaps suggested by Jewish usage[3].

7. Oil for the Unction of the Sick was hallowed by the Bishop and his concelebrating Presbyters with a prayer of consecration, *mutatis mutandis* identical in type with that with which the Eucharist was consecrated[4]; but, as was still the case at the beginning of the fifth century, it was administered and applied by anyone of the faithful, whether cleric or layman[5].

[1] 1 Cor. vii 39.

[2] Conc. Elib. *can.* 16, 17, 61, 66: Arelat. i *can.* 11: Neocaes. *can.* 2.

[3] Ambrosiaster *Quaest. V. et N. T.* cxxvii 3 quomodo ergo dici potest male fieri aut non licere quod ex Dei benedictione et ipso fauente augmentum facit? cuius rei traditio et in synagoga mansit et nunc in Ecclesia celebratur, ut Dei creatura sub Dei benedictione iungatur. Clem. Al. *Paed.* iii 11 § 63 τίνι γὰρ ὁ πρεσβύτερος ἐπιθήσει χεῖρας; τίνα δὲ εὐλογήσει; in view of the context may refer to the marriage-benediction.

[4] *Order* 1 § 22.

[5] This seems to be implied by the rubric 'si quis oleum offert.' (In the prayer the Latin translator evidently mistook χριομένοις for χρωμένοις and rendered it *utentibus*.) For 5th cent. usage see S. Innocent I *Ep.* xxv 11. In Clem. Al. *Excerpta ex Theodoto* 82 καὶ ὁ ἄρτος καὶ τὸ ἔλαιον ἁγιάζεται τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ θεοῦ (perhaps Gnostic), the allusion is probably to bread and oil hallowed for the use of the sick.

III

The Ministry of the Sacraments, then, was committed to the Apostles, and from them derived to the Bishops who preside, as the successors of the apostles, in the several churches[1].

The Bishop was elected from among their own number by the universal 'suffrage' of the faithful of his church, and the election was confirmed by the 'judgement' of the neighbouring bishops, representing the Church at large. So elected, the bishop was consecrated by the confirming bishops, with the imposition of hands and prayer; and by this consecration there was conferred upon him the authority[2] to administer the sacraments, and the *charisma* of his office, 'the grace of orders,' the gift of the Holy Ghost to enable him to fulfil rightly, blamelessly, and constantly, the functions committed to him. This sacerdotal ministry was shared with him in part by the Presbyters, as 'fellow-workers with his order,'[3] who with the bishop as their head and 'high-priest' formed a corporate priesthood. The Deacons were the ministers of the bishop, and in relation to the sacraments their functions were normally confined to the minor actions incidental to the celebration of them.

The central and characteristic action of the Church, its normal activity in relation to God and to its own members, was the offering of the Eucharist, in which its unity and fellowship found both expression and sustenance. And here the whole body of the Church acted together and in common, 'every man giving thanks in his own order.'[4] The laity, outwardly distributed in its

[1] P. 381, notes 1, 2.

[2] Ἐξουσία, *ius, potestas* (not δύναμις, *uis, potentia*), pp. 381 n. 2, 390 n. 1, 396 n. 3.

[3] 'Cooperatores ordinis nostri,' in the Roman form of the Ordination of Presbyters from the Leonine Sacramentary onwards.

[4] S. Clem. Rom. *ad Cor.* 41.

ranks according to sex and age[1], offered its oblations; the deacons received them and disposed them on the altar; the Bishop and his Presbyters consecrated them, all laying their hands on them while the bishop recited the Great Thanksgiving; and the laity added their assent in the Great *Amen*[2]. But when circumstances required it, this cooperation of the priesthood was as it were spread out and extended, and individual presbyters, instead of concelebrating with the bishop *in situ*, were commissioned to do their part in the common act elsewhere, in local congregations.

Baptism, Absolution, and Ordination, are all related to the Eucharist as avenues to it, either for participation or for ministry[3]. And this perhaps determined the limits which were set to the possible delegation of the administration of them to individual presbyters or to others. The bishop, as the normal minister of the sacraments, guards and controls the approaches to the Eucharist. Accordingly, in the creation of ministers of the altar, while the assent of the faithful generally is required to the choice of the persons to be ordained, it lies with the bishop alone to confer the authority: Ordination is reserved exclusively to the Bishop. The authority to confer Baptism, in view of its necessity, is extended to presbyters and deacons, at first occasionally, and then ordinarily, when the bishop is not at hand, and even to laymen in case of urgent need: but the initiation remains incomplete until it is completed and confirmed by the Imposition of the Hand of the Bishop. Absolution, which readmits the penitent to the fellowship of the Eucharist, is conferred, with the assent of the body of the faithful, by the Bishop, whether acting alone or with

1 *Didasc.* ii 57 §§ 2 sqq.

2 S. Justin M. *Ap.* i 65, 67.

3 This is expressed, as we have seen, by the administration of these rites in the course of the Liturgy, immediately before the Mass of the Faithful.

the cooperation of the clergy ; but since excommunication is not the annulling of baptism, and absolution is not an initiation *de nouo* but the restoration of the rights of an indelible initiation already conferred, in case of urgency its administration is extended to individual Presbyters, and by special commission in particular instances to Deacons.

In accordance with later usage, Marriage and the Unction of the Sick have been included above among the Sacraments. But the ministry of the Church in relation to Marriage in the ante-Nicene period, as always, was confined to the confirmation, by the invocation of the divine benediction, of what was already otherwise accomplished. As for the Unction of the Sick, it had no prominence in this period, and perhaps it was not yet any part of the universal system of the Church ; and it is only in the West that the hallowing of the oil has been reserved to bishops alone ; while in the fourth and following centuries not only the administration but even the hallowing was sometimes effected by laymen.

I

INDEX OF REFERENCES

A. HOLY SCRIPTURE . . . . p. 410
B. ANCIENT AUTHORITIES . . p. 413
C. MODERN AUTHORITIES . . p. 423

II

INDEX OF GREEK AND LATIN TERMS p. 427

III

INDEX OF PROPER NAMES . . p. 429

IV

INDEX OF SUBJECT-MATTER . . p. 436

In the second and third indices some of the more important references are indicated by the use of **heavy** *type*

I

INDEX OF REFERENCES

A. HOLY SCRIPTURE

Gen. xxxii 17–19...68
Exod. ix 5.....279, 281
Num. xi 16 ff. 285
xx 25, 26 230
xxvii 16–18 ...308
Deut. xvii 7 318
xvii 12.....239
1 Reg. (1 Sam.) xix 20 7
2 Reg. (2 Sam.) v 2...42
1 Esdr. viii 75 279
2 Esdr. ix 8 279
4 Esdr. vi 55.....13
vii 11 13
Ps. l (li) 12 .....279, 281
lxvii (lxviii) 18...70
lxvii (lxviii) 28...278
cxii (cxiii) 5, 6...279, 281
Prov. ix 18 .....152, 256
Cant. vi 8 246
Ecclus. xxvi 5 7
xxxi 30 260
Is. li 16.....13
lviii 6 279
Jer. vii 4 33
xiii 18–20 42
xxii, xxiii 42
Ez. ii 8–iii 3 80
xxxiv 23, 24 ...42
Dan. xiii (=Susan.) 42 .....279, 281
xiii (=Susan.) 52, 56 125
Zech. xi 6.....42
xii 10 285
Mal. i 11 35
Matt. vii 21 158
xvi 18, 19 .....4, 6, 246, 247, 253, 279
xviii 15–17 319
xviii 20 21
xix 28.....4, 304
xxii 25 68
xxviii 19.....158, 318, 346
Mark ii 10 279
Luke iii 3 316
xxii 30 .....4, 304
John xx 21–23 .....246, 259, 279, 281
xxi 16 42
Acts i 17 381
i 20 279
i 21–26 .....266, 279, 281, 307
i 25 381
ii 10 218
ii 23, 24 317
ii 29, 30 317
ii 33 317
ii 34 ff. 317
ii 38 .....316, 318
ii 42 .....102, 108
iii 15 317
iii 20 317
iii 21 317
iv 2 317
iv 24 317
v 17 7
vi 1–6.....81, 266
vi 9.....7
viii 16.....318
viii 17.....318

Acts viii 37 317
ix 20 317
x 42 317
x 43 317
x 48 .....318, 391
xi 27, 28.....80
xi 30 82
xiii 1 .....67, 80
xiii 2 .....28, 307
xiii 23.....317
xiii 24.....316
xiii 38.....317
xiii 46.....317
xiv 15 317
xiv 23 .....83, 266
xv 29 374
xvii 24 317
xvii 31 317
xix 2 ff. 317
xix 5 .....318, 391
xix 6 318
xx 21 316
xx 23 29
xx 28 .....29, 42, 65, 279, 281, 317
xxi 25.....374
xxii 16 318
xxiii 6.....317
xxvi 8 316
xxvi 11 360
xxvi 18 317
Rom. i 3 317
i 4 317
i 7 318
iv 25 317
v 6, 8 317
v 15 73
vi 2 ff. 318
vi 4, 5.....317
vi 11 318
vi 17 .....44, 317
vi 22, 23.....73, 317
viii 34 317
x 8, 9 316
xii 3, 6 .....73, 74
xv 16 227
xvi 5 20
xvi 17 318
1 Cor. i 2 318
1 Cor. i 4–7 73
i 13 318
i 14 ff.....391
iii 17 12
v 2 319
v 5 319
v 6 318
v 11 .....318, 319
v 13 319
vi 9, 10 319
vi 11 318
vii 7 74
vii 39 405
viii 6 317
x 2 7
xi 22 22
xi 23 44
xii 1 74
xii 3 316
xii 7–10 74
xii 8, 9 298
xii 12 ff. 74, 317
xii 18, 24 69
xii 27 .....22, 37
xii 28 ff. 32, 64, 65, 67, 68, 69, 75, 79, 285
xiv 1 74
xiv 29–33 80
xiv 31.....78
xiv 37.....74
xiv 40.....113
xv 317
xv 3–5.....44, 102, 317
xv 11 44
2 Cor. i 3 .....279, 281
i 21.....350
ii 5–10 319
ii 11 319
iv 4.....319
iv 5.....316
v 1 317
viii 19.....266
x 8 42
xi 3, 4.....44
xiii 10.....42, 319
xiii 13.....318
Gal. i 4.....319
i 9 .....44, 45

Gal. ii 2, 9 44
ii 20 317
iii 29 317
iv 4 317
iv 24–26 37
v 19–21 319
vi 6 40
vi 16 317
Eph. ii 20.....67
iii 5.....67
iv 3.....318
iv 4, 5.....243, 246
iv 11 .....42, 65, 69, 79, 81, 83
iv 13 318
v 25 4
vi 5 285
Phil. ii 1 318
ii 11 316
Col. iii 22.....285
1 Thess. i 9 317
i 10.....317
iv 7.....318
iv 14 317
iv 15 f. 317
iv 16 317
iv 17 317
v 11 ff. 40
v 14 318
2 Thess. i 7 317
i 10 317
ii 1 317
ii 15 44
iii 6.....44, 318, 319
iii 14 .....318, 319
iii 15 319
1 Tim. i 18 .....29, 265, 307
i 20 .....267, 319
iii 1–7.....267
iii 2.....84
iii 8–13 267
iii 13 .....288, 306
iii 15 22
iv 14 .....29, 75, 265
v 3–16 267
v 17 302
v 20 318
1 Tim. v 22 266
vi 20 45
2 Tim. i 6 .....31, 75, 266
i 13, 14 45
ii 2 45
ii 8 317
iii 8.....267
iv 2.....318
Tit. i 5.....266
i 5–9 267
i 7 84
i 9 45
i 13.....318
ii 11, 12 316
iii 5.....318
iii 10, 11.....45, 318, 319
Heb. iv 14 317
vi 1.....316
vi 2.....317, 318
vi 6.....319
x 25 20
xiii 7 71
James i 1 8
1 Pet. i 1 7
iv 10 ff. 32
v 2 ff. 42
v 3 382
1 Jo. i 9 318
iii 4.....318
iii 6, 9.....318
iv 15 317
v 5 317
v 13 317
v 17 318
v 18 318
v 19 319
3 Jo. 10 41
Apoc. i 6 397
iii 12 12
iv 4.....385
ix 21 319
x 8–11 80
xx 4 304
xxi 8 319
xxi 10.....12
xxi 27.....319
xxii 15 319

INDEX OF REFERENCES

B. ANCIENT AUTHORITIES

Abercius, epitaph of, p. 54
Achatii, Acta disputationis sancti, **i** p. 325
Acta: see Achatius, Cyprian, Marcellus, Maximilian, Perpetua, Philip, Pionius, Polycarp, Scillitan Martyrs
Adamantii Dialogus **i** 8 pp. 25, 204: **ii** 22 p. 25
de Aleatoribus: see pseudo-Cyprian
Ambrose *de Spiritu sancto* **i** prol. § 18 p. 187
pseudo-Ambrose *de sacramentis* **ii** 20 p. 345
Ambrosiaster *Quaestiones V. et N.T.* **xcvii** 20 p. 141: **ci** pp. 393, 396: **cx** 7 p. 205: **cxxvii** 3 p. 405
—— *Commentarii in Epp. Pauli: ad Eph. iv 12* p. 393
Amphilochius of Iconium *ad Seleuc.* p. 358
Ancyra, council of, A.D. 314, p. 362: see *Canons* of Ancyra
Apostolic Canons 46 p. 159: 47 pp. 155, 159: 62 p. 162: 68 p. 161
Apostolic Church Order pp. 270, 301, 302, 385, 386, 388
Apostolic Constitutions pp. 311, 312, 382: **ii** 16. 2 p. 370: **iii** 11. 1 p. 388: **vi** 15. 1–4 pp. 155, 159; 17. 2 p. 388: **viii** p. 270: 2. 4 p. 308; 4. 6 p. 278; 5 pp. 279, 280, 281; 16. 5 p. 284; 32. 16 p. 339; 32. 17 p. 331; 46. 4, 14 p. 304
Aristides *Apology* 3 p. 322; 15 p. 333
Arles, council of, A.D. 314, pp. 180, 362: for canons, see *Canons* of Arles I
Arnobius *adversus nationes* **vi** 20 p. 322
Athanasius *apologia contra Arianos* 6 p. 382: 11 p. 403: 12 pp. 170, 403: 28, 46, 74 p. 403: 76 pp. 170, 403: 77 p. 403: 84 p. 403: 85 p. 387
—— *orationes contra Arianos* **ii** 42, 43 p. 158
—— *de decretis* 26 p. 344
—— *de incarnatione* 33–40 p. 338
—— *ep. ad Rufinianum* p. 173
Athenagoras *Legatio pro Christianis* 30 p. 327
Augustine *contra epistulam Parmeniani* **ii** 13 [28, 30] pp. 191, 192, 195: 14 [32] pp. 186, 187
—— *de baptismo contra Donatistas* pp. 181, 187: **i** 2 [3] p. 151; 12 [18] p. 189; 13 [21] pp. 192, 195; 14 [22] p. 191: **ii** 12 p. 153: **iii** 5 [7] p. 256; 13 [18] p. 189; 14 [19] p. 188; 16 [21] p. 190; 17 [22] p. 189; 18 [23] p. 189: **iv** 6 [8] p. 181; 20 [27] p. 188: **v** 17 [23] p. 53; 23 [33] p. 190: **vi** 7 [10] p. 241
—— *de unico baptismo contra Petilianum* 13 [22] p. 220
—— *contra Cresconium Donatistam* **iii** 18 [21] p. 206

Augustine *de haeresibus ad Quodvultdeum* 44 p. 181
—— *confessiones* **iii** 19 p. 52: **vi** 8 p. 328: **viii** 30 p. 52
—— *epistulae* **lii** 2 p. 218: **liii** 1–4, 6 pp. 142, 193, 206: **clxxxv** 47 p. 185
Avellana, Collectio, pp. 174, 178
Avircium Marcellum, Anonymus *ad*: see Eus. *H.E.* **v** 16. 7, 17. 4
Barnabas, Epistle of, 18–20 p. 332
Basil *ep.* **clxxxviii** (*ad Amphilochium*) *can.* 1 pp. 151, 157, 164, 168, 169
Canons (see also Basil, Dionysius of Alexandria, Gregory Thaumaturgus, pseudo-Hippolytus, Peter of Alexandria, Theophilus of Alexandria)
Ancyra, A.D. 314
Can. 1 p. 395; 2 p. 388; 3 p. 382; 4–9 pp. 368, 370; 5 p. 371; 6 p. 366; 9 p. 370; 13 pp. 385, 401, 402; 16 pp. 368, 370; 18 p. 385; 20 p. 368; 21 pp. 367, 368, 370; 22 pp. 368, 370, 376; 23 p. 368; 24, 25 pp. 367, 368
Arles I, A.D. 314
Can. 3 p. 326; 6 p. 330; 7 p. 354; 8 pp. 345, 350; 9 p. 354; 11 p. 405; 13 pp. 358, 382; 15 p. 396; 16 p. 371; 19 p. 385; 20 pp. 385, 401; 22 pp. 366, 377
Constantinople I, A.D. 381
Can. 4 p. 170; 7 pp. 158, 178, 179
Elvira (Eliberis), *c.* A.D. 300
Can. 1 pp. 370, 376; 2 pp. 370, 377; 3 p. 370; 4 p. 339; 5 p. 366; 6 pp. 359, 370, 376, 377; 7 pp. 370, 377; 8 pp. 370, 376; 10 p. 370; 12, 13 pp. 370, 377; 14 p. 366; 16 p. 405; 17 pp. 370, 377, 405; 18 pp. 370, 377; 21 p. 353; 22 p. 366; 24 p. 301; 25 p. 354; 27 p. 382; 28 p. 367; 30 p. 301; 31 p. 366; 32 pp. 385, 398; 38 pp. 350, 384, 392, 393; 39 p. 330; 40 p. 370; 42 p. 339; 47 pp. 370, 377; 50 p. 382; 53 pp. 371, 385; 55 p. 370; 56 p. 324; 57, 59 p. 370; 61 pp. 363, 405; 62 p. 329; 63 pp. 370, 377; 64 pp. 366, 370, 376; 65 pp. 370, 377; 66 pp. 363, 370, 376, 405; 70 p. 370; 71, 72 pp. 370, 376; 73, 75 pp. 370, 377; 76 p. 366; 77 pp. 350, 378, 384, 387, 392, 393, 396; 79 p. 363; 80 p. 301
Laodicea, A.D. 363?
Can. 7, 8 p. 158; 20–22, 24, 25 p. 388
Neocaesarea, A.D. 314
Can. 2 pp. 363, 366, 370, 377, 405; 3 p. 371; 4 p. 360; 5 pp. 330, 339; 6 p. 343; 7 pp. 366, 398; 9 p. 395; 10 p. 388; 12 pp. 320, 348; 14 p. 386
Nicaea, A.D. 325
Can. 1 p. 382; 2 pp. 358, 382; 3 p. 382; 4 pp. 385, 401; 5 pp. 340, 341, 358, 371, 372; 6 p. 358; 8 pp. 157, 170, 176, 208–10, 401; 9 pp. 358, 401; 10 p. 358; 11 p. 368; 12 pp. 368, 369, 371; 13 pp. 354, 358, 368, 371; 14 pp. 330, 339; 15 p. 358; 16 pp. 358, 401; 17 p. 358; 18 pp. 358, 387, 395, 396; 19 pp. 157, 358, 385; 20 p. 340
Orleans A.D. 511
Can. 10 p. 178
Saragossa, A.D. 592
Can. 1, 3 p. 178
Sardica, A.D. 343
Can. 10 p. 306
Celestine, pope, *epistula ad concilium Ephesinum* p. 206
Celsus *True Word* p. 324

Chrysostom, John, *homiliae in ep. ad Ephesios* **xi** p. 171
Clarus of Mascula: see Cyprian *sententiae episcoporum* 79
Clement of Alexandria *Excerpta ex Theodoto* 82 p. 405
—— *Hypotyposes* fragm. 10=Eus. *H.E.* **ii** 1. 3 pp. 49, 138: fragm. 13=Eus. *H.E.* **ii** 1. 4 p. 49
—— *Paedagogus* **i** 5. 21, 22 p. 16; 6. 32 p. 343; 6. 42 p. 16; 6. 45 p. 352; 9. 84. 3 p. 16: **ii** 1. 6 p. 15: **iii** 11. 63 p. 405; 12. 99 p. 16
—— *Protrepticus* 9. 82. 6 p. 16: 10. 100. 4 p. 325: 12. 119. 1 p. 16
—— *Quis dives* 42 pp. 29, 49, 382
—— *Stromateis* **i** 1. 11 pp. 50, 134, 201; 14. 64 p. 201; 19. 96 pp. 152, 256, 351, 358: **ii** 13. 56, 57 p. 373: **iv** 8. 66 pp. 15, 385: **vi** 7. 61 p. 49; 13. 106 pp. 282, 385; 13. 107 p. 385; 16. 146 p. 16: **vii** 10. 55, 56 p. 50; 11. 68 p. 15; 14. 87 p. 17; 16. 92, 99, 104 p. 18; 17. 106, 107 p. 19
Clement of Rome *ad Corinthios* 5 p. 114; 29 p. 8; 40–44 pp. 110–113; 41 p. 406; 42 pp. 29, 30, 111, 119; 44 pp. 30, 199, 354, 394
II Clement 12 p. 36; 14 pp. 11, 12, 15, 36
pseudo-Clementine
—— *Homilies* **iii** 63 p. 303; 72 pp. 382, 398, 401: **xi** 36 p. 302
—— *Recognitions* **iii** 66 pp. 298, 302, 303; 67 pp. 342, 343, 346: **iv** 32 p. 342: **vi** 15 pp. 302, 342
—— *Epistle to James* 2 pp. 303, 358, 398: 3 p. 303: 6 p. 398: 12 p. 365: 19 pp. 303, 401
—— *Epistle of Peter to James* 3 p. 358
Constantine: see Eus. *H.E.* **x** 5. 23; 7. 2
Constantinople, council of, A.D. 381: see *Canons* of Constantinople I
Constitutiones per Hippolytum: see pseudo-Hippolytus
Cornelius, pope, *epistula ad Fabium*: see Eus. *H.E.* **vi** 43. 5–20
Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum **iii** 12283 p. 199
Cyprian (see also Pontius *vita Cypriani*)
—— *de bono patientiae* 14 p. 360
—— *ad Demetrianum* 14 p. 322; 22 p. 350
—— *de dominica oratione* 4 p. 228; 18 pp. 353, 354, 356; 19 p. 343; 24 p. 360
—— *ad Donatum* 7, 8 pp. 327, 328; 11 p. 369
—— *ad Fortunatum* praef. § 4 p. 383; 7 p. 343
—— *de habitu virginum* 7 p. 343
—— *de lapsis* 8 p. 343; 9 p. 352; 16 p. 369; 25 pp. 352, 353, 384, 388, 395; 26 p. 354; 28 pp. 357, 384; 29 pp. 229, 369; 30, 35 p. 369; 36 pp. 368, 369
—— *de opere et eleemosynis* 15 p. 351
—— *de unitate catholicae ecclesiae* pp. 242–244; 4 pp. 245, 246, 247, 250–253; 5–7 p. 258; 5 p. 244; 6 pp. 38, 239; 7 p. 238; 10 pp. 36, 143; 11 pp. 36, 257; 12 pp. 21, 260; 13 p. 228; 14 pp. 36, 360; 17 p. 36; 18 pp. 228, 350; 23 p. 244
—— *epistulae* (square brackets indicate that the letter is not Cyprian's own) **i** 1 pp. 226, 233, 385, 386, 388; 2 pp. 228, 355, 384: **iii** p. 286; 1 pp. 240, 384; 3 pp. 141, 384, 387: **iv** 4 pp. 239, 365, 372: **v** p. 234; 2 pp. 237, 395: **vii** p. 230: [**viii** p. 234; 2 p. 366; 3 p. 354:] **ix** p. 234; 1 p. 389: **xii** p. 234: **xiv** p. 234; 4 p. 234: **xv–xx** p. 400; **xv** 1 pp. 237, 360, 372, 384: **xvi** 2 pp. 237, 372, 373, 384, 386, 398: **xvii** 1 pp. 365, 372; 2 pp. 237, 372, 384, 385, 386; 3 pp. 365, 372: **xviii** 1 pp. 234, 237, 372, 398, 399: **xix** 1 p. 372; 2 pp. 233, 237, 398: **xx** 3 p. 372: [**xxiii** pp. 230, 305, 389, 400: **xxiv** 1 p. 233:] **xxvi** p. 400: **xxvii** p. 400: **xxix** pp. 230, 236, 291, 299, 302, 331, 382, 384, 389: [**xxx** p. 235; 5 pp. 235, 365; 6

p. 367; 8 p. 369: **xxxi** 5 p. 229; 6 pp. 235, 365:] **xxxiii** 1 pp. 130, 131, 202, 238, 247, 394, 400: **xxxiv** 1 p. 395; 3 p. 234; 4 p. 305: [**xxxvi** 2 p. 399:] **xxxviii** p. 291; 1 pp. 230, 233; 2 pp. 230, 389: **xxxix** p. 291; 3 p. 355; 4 pp. 384, 389; 5 pp. 226, 384, 385: **xl** pp. 385, 396: **xli** 2 pp. 226, 361, 387: [**xlii** p. 361:] **xliii** 2 p. 233: 5 p. 239: **xlv** 2 p. 385; 3 pp. 131, 202: **xlviii** 3 p. 249: [**xlix** 2 pp. 238, 365:] **lii** 1 pp. 305, 389; 2 pp. 362, 402; 3 pp. 362, 364: **lv** 1 pp. 226, 249; 6 p. 400; 8 pp. 226, 231, 247, 300, 306, 354, 384, 401, 403; 11 pp. 162, 372, 373; 13 p. 371; 14 p. 229; 17 pp. 370, 376, 400; 18 p. 356; 21 pp. 242, 374; 23 pp. 369, 377, 400; 24 p. 239; 26 p. 376; 27 pp. 360, 369; 29 pp. 369, 372: **lvi** 1 p. 300: **lvii** p. 371; 3 pp. 228, 367, 384; 5 p. 372: **lviii** 1 p. 130; 9 p. 350: **lix** 1 p. 361; 5 pp. 232, 354, 401; 14 pp. 248, 250, 360, 365; 15 pp. 364, 373; 16, 17 p. 365; 20 p. 366: **lxi** 3 pp. 237, 386, 396: **lxiii** p. 351; 8 p. 377; 14 pp. 228, 384; 18, 19 p. 360: **lxiv** 1 pp. 240, 371, 373; 2–6 p. 353; 4 p. 378: **lxv** 2 p. 384; 4 pp. 162, 185, 232: **lxvi** 1 p. 232; 4 pp. 130, 202; 5 p. 238; 8 pp. 239, 244: **lxvii** 2 pp. 229, 384; 3–5 pp. 300, 354, 384, 401; 3 p. 232; 4 pp. 141, 230, 388; 5 pp. 231, 403; 6 p. 162: **lxviii** 2 pp. 300, 354, 361, 401: **lxix** 1 p. 360; 3 pp. 202, 239; 5 pp. 143, 202; 7 pp. 150, 344, 345; 8 p. 383; 10 p. 166; 11 p. 259; 12, 16 p. 348: **lxx** p. 257; 1 pp. 259, 342, 383; 2 pp. 36, 167, 259, 342, 344, 345, 349; 3 pp. 247, 259: **lxxi** 1 pp. 258, 260; 3 pp. 248, 257; 4 pp. 153, 220: **lxxii** pp. 248, 257; 1 pp. 166, 377; 2 pp. 163, 233, 373, 384; 3 p. 241: **lxxiii** 3 pp. 153, 220; 4 p. 347; 5 pp. 346, 347; 7 p. 247; 9 pp. 350, 384, 393, 394; 10, 11 p. 259; 16 pp. 160, 346; 17 p. 346; 18 pp. 345, 346; 21 pp. 259, 377; 24 p. 260; 26 pp. 53, 240: **lxxiv** 2 p. 142; 5 pp. 167, 346; 11 p. 258: [**lxxv** (Firmilian's letter) 4 p. 372; 6 p. 254; 7 pp. 153, 161, 210, 257, 381, 393; 8 p. 167; 9 pp. 160, 259, 346; 10 pp. 273, 305, 344, 358; 11 pp. 344, 346, 347; 14 p. 38; 16 pp. 130, 131, 202, 247, 381; 17 p. 202; 18 pp. 160, 346, 347; 19 pp. 153, 256; 21 p. 378; 25 p. 259: **lxxvii** 3 p. 305: **lxxviii** 1 p. 305]

Cyprian *quod idola dii non sint* 7 p. 329

—— *testimonia* **i** proem. p. 339: **iii** p. 333; **119** p. 374

—— *sententiae episcoporum* p. 257; praef. pp. 53, 240; 1 pp. 393, 395, 398; 4 p. 373; 5 p. 377; 8 p. 343; 18 p. 342; 20 p. 262; 29 p. 358: 31 p. 343; 37 pp. 341, 343; 79 pp. 130, 131, 202

—— *acta proconsularia sancti Cypriani* 1 p. 355

pseudo-Cyprian *de aleatoribus* 1 pp. 203, 304, 397; 3 pp. 350, 401; 4 pp. 356, 363; 9 p. 343

—— *de duplici martyrio* 31 p. 290

—— *de rebaptismate* 1 pp. 154, 350; 4 pp. 348, 350, 353, 379, 393; 5 pp. 346, 348, 353; 6 pp. 165, 350; 7 pp. 160, 346; 10 pp. 160, 165, 166, 179, 344, 350, 392, 393; 11 p. 331; 12 p. 382; 14 p. 331; 15 p. 154

—— *de spectaculis*: see Novatian

Cyril of Jerusalem *Procatechesis* 4 p. 340

—— *Catecheses* pp. 331, 333: **vi** 12–34 p. 337: **xvi** 6–10 p. 337

Didache Apostolorum (*Teaching* or *Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles*) pp. 23, 59 ff., 273; 1–5 p. 332; 2, 3 p. 360; 4 pp. 63, 71; 7 pp. 341, 342, 346, 348, 349, 378; 9 pp. 24, 40; 10 pp. 24, 62, 294, 394; 11–13 p. 62; 14 p. 394; 15 pp. 63, 394

Didascalia Apostolorum (the references in the sixth Essay are to Funk's divisions into books and chapters: those in the fifth Essay, which are only two in number, p. 303 *Didasc.* 4 [= **ii** 2] and p. 304 *Didasc.* 9 [= **ii** 26], are to the chapter-divisions in the Syriac) pp. 301, 383, 398:

ii 2 pp. 303, 401; 6 p. 365; 9 p. 356; 11 pp. 357, 383; 12–18 p. 365; 16 pp. 368, 369, 370; 17 p. 356; 18 pp. 357, 373, 383; 20 p. 366; 25 p. 354; 26 pp. 304, 381, 383; 27 pp. 354, 388; 28 pp. 354, 385, 388; 32 pp. 383, 393; 33 pp. 365, 383, 393; 34 pp. 357, 383; 37 pp. 356, 364; 38 pp. 330, 357, 364; 39 pp. 330, 367; 41 pp. 366, 367, 373, 383; 43 p. 373; 44 p. 365; 45 p. 364; 47–50 p. 364; 50 p. 366; 54 pp. 383, 388; 57 pp. 385, 387, 388, 407; 58 pp. 354, 383, 395; 59 p. 353; 62 p. 327.
iii 8 p. 366; 9 p. 393; 12 pp. 343, 346, 351, 354, 383, 387, 391, 393; 13 pp. 354, 365.
iv 6 p. 360; 8 p. 367.
v 17, 18, 19 p. 342.
vi 12 p. 333; 22 p. 355
Didascaliae Apostolorum fragmenta: see Hippolytus *Church Order*
Didymus of Alexandria *de Trinitate* **ii** 15 p. 393
Digest I **xiii** 1 p. 341
Diogenes Laertius **i** 116 p. 199; **ii** 12, 19, 98, 106 pp. 198, 199
Diognetum, Epistula ad, 2, 7 p. 322
Dionysius of Alexandria (see also Eus. *H.E.* **vi** 44, 45: **vii** 5, 7, 8, 9, 11) p. 53
—— *epistula canonica* 1 p. 342
—— *epistula ad Cononem* p. 371
Dionysius of Corinth: see Eus. *H.E.* **iv** 23. 6
Dionysius of Rome: see Athanasius *de decretis*
pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite *de ecclesiastica hierarchia* **v** 2, 3 p. 278
Egyptian Church Order: see Hippolytus *Church Order*
Elvira (Illiberis or Eliberis), council of, *c.* A.D. 300 (for canons see *Canons* of Elvira) pp. 305, 362
Ephrem Syrus *adv. haer. serm.* **xxiii** p. 204
Epiphanius *adv. haereses* **xxvii** 6 pp. 115, 118, 205: **xxix** 4 p. 115: **xxxiii** 7 p. 200: **xlix** 2 p. 273: **lxix** 1 p. 387: **lxxii** 3 p. 335
Eusebius of Caesarea
—— *chronica*: see Jerome
—— *praeparatio evangelica* **iv** 22 p. 341: **xv** 18 p. 199
—— *historia ecclesiastica* **i** 1. 1 pp. 134, 135, 203; 1. 4 pp. 135, 203.
ii 1. 3 p. 138; 17. 21, 22 p. 342; 17. 23 p. 385; 23. 1 p. 138; 23. 3 pp. 133, 203, 207; 23. 4 pp. 120, 199; 23. 8 p. 115; 24 p. 138.
iii 2 pp. 139, 382; 3. 3 p. 203; 4. 8 pp. 140, 382; 5. 2 p. 382; 14 p. 136; 15 p. 136; 21 p. 139; 22 p. 37; 25. 6 p. 203; 27 p. 401; 32. 7 p. 119; 35 p. 136; 36. 2 pp. 139, 204, 382; 37. 1, 4 p. 203.
iv 1 pp. 136, 139, 204, 382; 4 p. 136; 5. 2 pp. 137, 204; 5. 4 p. 138; 5. 5 pp. 136, 139; 8. 2 pp. 54, 115, 119, 207; 10 p. 382; 11 p. 142; 11. 2 p. 200; 11. 7 pp. 118, 207; 14. 5 p. 200; 19 p. 136; 20 p. 139; 21 p. 207; 22. 3 pp. 54, 117, 118, 199; 22. 5 pp. 116, 300; 22. 6 p. 116; 23. 6 pp. 361, 374; 24 p. 139.
v praef. 1 p. 139; 1. 10, 26 p. 290; 1. 45 p. 37; 1. 48, 2. 3 p. 290; 2. 7 p. 37; 3. 4 p. 290; 4. 2 p. 354; 5 p. 325; 5. 9 p. 204; 6. 2–5 p. 200; 11. 2 pp. 134, 203; 11. 5 p. 134; 12. 1, 2 pp. 137, 204; 13. 5 p. 53; 16. 5 p. 385; 16. 7 p. 201; 16. 10 p. 361; 17. 4 pp. 201, 401; 18. 5 pp. 290, 401; 18. 7 p. 273; 18. 9 p. 362; 20. 1 pp. 134, 203; 22 p. 139; 24. 9 p. 361; 24. 12 p. 342; 24. 13 p. 53; 24. 14 p. 124; 24. 17 p. 394; 25 p. 204; 28. 3 pp. 140, 202; 28. 6 p. 361; 28. 7 p. 136; 28. 9 p. 361; 28. 10 p. 382; 28. 12 pp. 369, 382, 385.
vi 4. 3 p. 331; 9. 1 pp. 133, 203; 9. 2 p. 342; 11. 2 pp. 299, 401; 11. 6 p. 354; 12. 6 p. 201; 13. 8 pp. 133, 203; 23. 4 p. 401; 25. 3 p. 358;

29. 2 p. 382; 29. 3 pp. 299, 303, 354, 401; 29. 4 pp. 133, 203, 354; 34 pp. 342, 367; 38 p. 401; 39. 1, 3 p. 136; 41. 3, 7, 8 p. 360; 43. 2 pp. 235, 361; 43. 6 p. 373; 43. 7 p. 402; 43. 8 pp. 301, 401, 402, 403; 43. 9 pp. 168, 301, 401, 402, 403; 43. 10 pp. 163, 203, 373; 43. 11 pp. 302, 305, 354, 389; 43. 14 p. 348; 43. 15 pp. 350, 358, 378, 393; 43. 17 pp. 299, 348, 354, 373, 378, 382, 401; 43. 19 p. 352; 44. 4 pp. 354, 377; 45 p. 360.
vii 2 pp. 136, 382; 5. 1, 2 p. 376; 5. 5 p. 153; 5. 6 p. 385; 7. 4 p. 361; 7. 5 pp. 153, 256; 8 p. 343; 9. 2 p. 344; 9. 5 p. 368; 11. 3 p. 385; 11. 10 p. 355; 13. 3 p. 355; 14 p. 136; 19 pp. 133, 136, 138, 203, 303; 30. 17 p. 361; 30. 18 p. 136; 32. 6 pp. 133, 203; 32. 32 pp. 134, 203.
viii praef. pp. 134, 204; 1. 2 p. 324; 1. 7 p. 326; 4. 2–4 p. 326; 9. 7 p. 324; 11. 2 p. 324. **ix** 2. 1 p. 355.
x 4. 44 p. 385; 4. 61 p. 382; 4. 63 p. 330; 4. 66 p. 385; 5. 23 p. 385; 7. 2 p. 382
Eusebius *vita Constantini* **iv** 57 p. 342
Felix III, pope, *epistula* **xiii** [**xiv**] *ad Fravitam* p. 175
Firmicus Maternus *de errore profanarum religionum* 14 p. 322
Firmilian of Caesarea: see Cyprian *ep.* **lxxv**
Gaius, Roman presbyter: see Eus. *H.E.* **v** 28. 3, 10, 12
Gelasian Sacramentary p. 378; **I xliv, lxxv** p. 345
Gelasius, pope, *ep.* **i** [**iii**] *ad Euphemium* p. 175
Gregory the Great, pope, *ep.* **iv** 26 p. 393
Gregory Nazianzen, *oratio* **xxi** 8 p. 205
Gregory Thaumaturgus *epistola canonica* pp. 362, 368
Hegesippus *Hypomnemata*, pp. 115–120, 199, 207: see Eusebius *H.E.* **ii** 23. 3, 4: **iii** 32. 7: **iv** 8. 2, 11. 7, 21, 22. 3–6, and Epiphanius *Haer.* **xxvii** 6, **xxix** 4
Heracleon the Gnostic *Fragments* p. 11
Hermas *Shepherd* (or *Pastor*): *Visions* **i** 3. 4 p. 13: **ii** 4. 1 p. 13: **iii** 3. 3 p. 14; 3. 5 p. 13; 5. 1 p. 13; 7 p. 19; 7. 6 p. 14; 8. 9 p. 13; 9. 7 p. 385: **iv** 2. 1 p. 13
—— *Mandates* **iv** 1, 3 pp. 373, 374; **viii** p. 333
—— *Similitudes* **vii** 4 p. 368: **viii** 3 p. 15: **ix** 1 p. 13
Hippolytus (? see also Eus. *H.E.* **v** 28. 3 [*Little Labyrinth*?] p. 140)
—— *Philosophumena* (or *Refutatio omnium haeresium*) **i** praef. pp. 48, 129, 131, 202, 304, 381; 5 p. 198; **vii** 38 p. 401; **ix** 7, 10 p. 202; 12 pp. 39, 155, 355, 361, 375, 382
—— *in Daniel.* **i** 16 p. 340; 17 p. 356: **iii** 18, 19 p. 394: **iv** 9 p. 350
—— *in Prov.* xxiv 50, 51 [xxx 15, 16] p. 375
—— *contra Noetum* 1 pp. 344, 361; 8 p. 344
—— *Church Order* (or *First Church Order* or *Apostolic Tradition*) pp. 268–9, 270, 272 4, 320: Latin version in Hauler *Didascaliae Apostolorum fragmenta Veronensia* pp. 274, 280, 282, 283, 284, 286, 304: (detailed references according to the chapter-numbering in Funk, see p. 320 n. 1) 1 pp. 129, 279–281, 351, 354, 381, 400, 405; 2 pp. 284, 285, 386, 400, 401; 3 pp. 286, 288, 354, 387, 388, 395, 401; 4 pp. 351, 382; 5, 6 pp. 389, 401; 10 pp. 320, 321; 11 pp. 321–330; 12 p. 339; 14 p. 331; 15 pp. 330, 341–342, 351; 16 pp. 342–345, 349, 351, 352, 353, 393; 18–22 p. 354; 19, 20 p. 330; 25 pp. 341, 342; 26 pp. 354, 365; 29, p. 354; 31 p. 355
pseudo-Hippolytus *Canons* pp. 270, 303, 304, 311, 312, 382: **iii** pp. 280, 281: **iv** pp. 276, 277, 283, 284: **v** pp. 287, 288
pseudo-Hippolytus *Constitutiones per Hippolytum* (or *Epitome*) pp. 270, 279, 280, 282, 284, 311, 312

Ignatius *ad Magnesios* 6 pp. 385, 387; 7 p. 113; 13 pp. 114, 385
—— *ad Philadelphenos* 4 p. 239; 5 p. 113; 7 p. 29; 9 p. 114
—— *ad Polycarpum* 5 p. 404
—— *ad Romanos* 4 p. 114
—— *ad Smyrnaeos* 8 pp. 24, 113, 238, 255, 391, 394, 395
—— *ad Trallianos* 2 pp. 113, 387; 3 pp. 113, 114, 385; 7 p. 114
Innocent I, pope, *ep.* **vi** *ad episcopos Apuliae* p. 168: *ep.* **xiv** *ad Bonifacium* p. 171: *ep* **xviii** *ad Alexandrum* pp. 167, 168: *ep.* **xxii** *ad episcopos Macedoniae* 3 pp. 163, 209; 4 p. 163; 5 pp. 164, 208: *ep.* **xxv** *ad Decentium* 11 p. 405
Irenaeus (see also Eusebius *H.E.* **v** 24)
—— *adversus haereses* **i** 9. 4 pp. 334, 358; 10. 1 p. 337; 10. 2 p. 54; 13. 3 p. 126; 13. 5 p. 369; 21. 3 p. 346; 27. 1 pp. 116, 142, 200, 201, 381.
ii praef. p. 201; 9. 2 p. 201; 14. 7 p. 201; 22. 4 p. 352; 32. 3 p. 341.
iii 2. 1–4. 1 pp. 45–46, 122–124, 200; 3. 3 pp. 381, 382; 4. 1 pp. 337; 4. 2 pp. 361, 373; 4. 3 p. 142; 11. 8 p. 34; 12. 14 p. 374; 16. 5 p. 337; 17. 2 p. 34; 24. 1 pp. 34, 37, 127.
iv p. 338; praef. 2, 3 p. 360; 8. 1 p. 8; 18. 1 p. 35; 23. 2 p. 331; 26. 2–5 pp. 46, 124–126, 185, 200; 32. 1–33. 8 pp. 126–127; 32. 1 p. 124; 33. 1 p. 34; 33. 2 p. 351; 33. 4 p. 37; 33. 7 pp. 34, 333, 337, 360; 33. 8 p. 200.
v 1. 3 p. 351; 2. 2 p. 351; 30. 3 p. 207
—— *Epideixis* pp. 333, 338; 3 p. 346; 6 p. 337
Jerome *epistulae* **xiv** 8 p. 205: **xli** 3 p. 205: **lxxix** 10 p. 374: **cxxii** 4 p. 374: **cxlvi** 1 pp. 205, 276, 303, 396, 402: **cxlvii** 3 p. 374
—— *comm. in ep. ad Galatas* **vi** 6 pp. 40, 330
—— *dialogus adversus Luciferianos* p. 173; 9 pp. 165, 179, 180, 255; 13 p. 163; 26 p. 208
—— *de viris illustribus* 1 p. 142; 22 p. 115; 53 p. 224
—— *chronicon* p. 135: Ann. Abr. 2048 p. 138: A.A. 2058 pp. 139, 142: A.A. 2078 p. 138: A.A. 2084 p. 139
Justin Martyr *apologia* **i** 14–17 p. 333; 21 p. 344; 31–52 p. 338; 31 pp. 344, 360; 39 p. 325; 42, 46 p. 344; 61 pp. 341, 346, 378; 65, 67 pp. 330, 351, 353, 354, 378, 388, 394, 407
—— *apologia* **ii** 6, 8 p. 341; 10 p. 34
—— *dialogus cum Tryphone* p. 338; 63 p. 344; 85 pp. 341, 344; 117 p. 227; 121 p. 341; 123 p. 8
pseudo-Justin *quaestiones et responsiones ad orthodoxos* **xiv** p. 210
Justinian, emperor, *Novell.* 59 p. 305
Lactantius *divinae institutiones* **ii** 16 p. 329: **iv** 27 p. 342: **vi** 20 pp. 323 324–325, 327: **vii** 19 p. 342
—— *de mortibus persecutorum* 10 p. 326
Lampridius *Vita Alexandri* (*Severi*) 39 p. 322; 45 p. 300
—— *Vita Elagabali* 3 p. 322
Laodicea, council of: see *Canons* of
Leo I, pope, *ep.* **clvi** 5 p. 167: **clxvii** p. 174
Leonine Sacramentary p. 406
Liber pontificalis **xv** p. 382
Liberian chronographer, A.D. 354, p. 142
Liberius, pope, *ep. ad Constantium* p. 204
Marcelli, acta sancti, p. 325
Marcellinus and Faustinus *Libellus precum* 92–105 p. 174
Maximiliani, acta sancti, p. 325

Minucius Felix *Octavius* 8 p. 323; 12 p. 327; 26, 27 p. 329; 31 p. 323; 37 pp. 327, 328
Neocaesarea, council of, p. 362: see *Canons* of Neocaesarea
Nicaea, council of, A.D. 325 (for canons, see *Canons* of Nicaea) p. 362
—— *ep. ad ecclesiam Alexandrinam* (Socrates *H.E.* **i** 9) pp. 176, 358, 401
—— second council of, A.D. 787, Acts of, pp. 173, 177, 210
Niceta of Remesiana *de Symbolo* 6 p. 345
Nicolas I, pope, *Responsio ad Bulgaros* p. 346
Novatian (see also Cyprian *ep.* **xxx**)
—— *de Trinitate* 1 pp. 344, 358; 9 p. 344; 29 p. 38
—— *de spectaculis* p. 328; 4 pp. 327, 328; 5–8 p. 328; 5 pp. 328, 354; 8 p. 328
Odes of Solomon **iv** p. 8: **xxviii** p. 8
Optatus Milevitanus **ii** 3 pp. 142, 204; 4 p. 205; 24 p. 163
Origen (and see Eus. *H.E.* **vi** 38)
—— *in Genesim* **ii** 3 p. 39
—— *in Exodum* **vi** 9 p. 360: **viii** 4, 5 p. 343: **xi** 6 p. 396: **xiii** 3 p. 330
—— *in Leviticum* **ii** 4 pp. 357, 368, 369; **v** 4 pp. 228, 366; **12** p. 186: **vi** 2 p. 330; 3 pp. 230, 299; 5 p. 350: **viii** 3 p. 352: **ix** 9 p. 350; 10 p. 330: **xi** 2 p. 360: **xiv** 2, 3 p. 356; 4 pp. 357, 369: **xv** 2 pp. 357, 360, 373
—— *in Numeros* **v** 1 p. 344: **xii** 4 p. 343: **xxii** 4 pp. 299, 308, 401
—— *in Iesu Nave* **iii** 5 p. 38: **iv** 1 pp. 330, 352, 391: **vii** 6 pp. 356, 365: **xxi** 1 p. 357: **xxiv** 1 p. 341
—— *in Iudic.* **ii** 5 p. 356: **v** 6 p. 332
—— *hom. in Psalm. xxxvi* **i** 5 p. 360: *in Psalm. xxxvii* **i** 1 p. 356; **ii** 1, 2, 6 p. 357: *in Psalm. xxxviii* **ii** 5 p. 343
—— *in Ieremiam* **v** 13 p. 332: **xi** 3 pp. 382, 385: **xii** 5 p. 365
—— *selecta in Ieremiam xxix 4* p. 356: *xxxviii* [*xlv*] *19* p. 38: *l* [*xxvii*] *25* p. 39
—— *in Ezechielem* **vi** 5 p. 330
—— *selecta in Ezechielem ix 4, xvi 9* p. 350
—— *in Matthaeum* **xi** 18 p. 330: **xii** 14 pp. 356, 357, 359, 398: **xiii** 30 pp. 357, 360: **xiv** 17 pp. 36–37: **xv** 26 p. 385: **xvi** 6 p. 331; 8 p. 356; 21 p. 38; 22 pp. 303, 385
—— *in Matthaeum commentariorum series* 28 p. 358; 89 pp. 351, 367; 114 p. 360; 117 p. 358
—— *in Lucam* **xiv** p. 352: **xvii** p. 357: **xxi** p. 341: **xxii** p. 330
—— *in Ioannem* **vi** 17 p. 346: **x** 23 p. 38: **xiii** 16 p. 358: **xxxii** 9 p. 333: fr. 45 p. 37
—— *in epistolam ad Romanos* **v** 6 p. 352; 8 pp. 346, 350, 377
—— *in epistolam* **i** *ad Corinthios v 10* p. 324
—— *contra Celsum* **i** 6 p. 341; 67 p. 341; 68 p. 329: **iii** 30 p. 9; 51 pp. 330, 356, 373: **iv** 27 pp. 351, 367: **vi** 10 p. 332; 35 p. 17: **viii** 22 p. 340; 73, 74 p. 324; 75 p. 323
—— *exhortatio ad martyrium* 17 p. 343
—— *de oratione* 28 pp. 292, 356, 360, 373, 375
—— *de principiis* **i** praef. 2 pp. 50, 202; praef. 4 pp. 336–337: **i** 3 pp. 350, 377: **iv** 9 (= *Philocalia* **i** 9) pp. 50, 202; 33 p. 358
Orleans, council of, A.D. 511: see *Canons* of Orleans
Pachomii Vita 18 p. 205
Pacian of Barcelona *ep.* **iii** 26 p 247
Papias fragmm. 6, 7 p. 37

Perpetuae et Felicitatis Martyrium p. 219; 13 p. 302
Peter of Alexandria *canones* p. 370; 10 p. 382
Philippi Heracliensis Martyrium 1 p. 306
Photius *Bibliotheca* (or *Myriobiblon*) cod. **ccxxxii** 13 p. 115
Pionii Smyrnaei Martyrium 3 p. 354; 9 p. 26
Plinius Secundus *ep.* **x** 96 pp. 353, 360
Plutarch *epitome* **i** 3 p. 197: *de exilio* 14 p. 198
Polycarp *ep. ad Philippenses* 5 p. 387
Polycarpi Martyrium 9 p. 360; 14 p. 280; 16 p. 295
Pontius *vita Cypriani* 7 p. 350
Porphyry ap. Eus. *Praep. Evan.* **iv** 22 p. 341
Ptolemaeus the Gnostic *ep. ad Floram* ap. Epiph. *Haer.* **xxxiii** 7 pp. 116, 200
Quaestiones: see Ambrosiaster and pseudo-Justin
de Rebaptismate: see pseudo-Cyprian
Rufinus *expositio symboli apostolorum* p. 335
—— *historia ecclesiastica* **x** 29 p. 173
Sacramentaries: see *Gelasian*, *Leonine*, Serapion
de Sacramentis [pseudo-Ambrose] **ii** 20 p. 345
Saragossa, council of, A.D. 592: see *Canons* of Saragossa
Sarapion: see Serapion
Sardica, council of, A.D. 343, p. 183: and see *Canons* of Sardica
Scillitan martyrs, *Acts of the*, pp. 219, 220, 343
Serapion of Antioch ap. Eus. *H.E.* **vi** 12. 6 p. 201
Serapion (or Sarapion) of Thmuis *Sacramentary* pp. 297, 298, 299: 14 p. 204
Severus of Antioch *epistulae* pp. 172, 211–214
Siricius, pope, *ep.* **i** 1 pp. 145, 167
Socrates Scholasticus *historia ecclesiastica* **i** 6 p. 361; 8 pp. 334, 335; 9 pp. 176, 358, 401: **vi** 8 p. 141
pseudo-Solomon: see *Odes of Solomon*
Sozomen *historia ecclesiastica* **i** 15 p. 387: **vii** 16 p. 367
Statuta Ecclesiae Antiqua (= so-called fourth council of Carthage) 4 p. 286
Statutes of the Apostles pp. 270, 271, 289, 295, 311, 312
Suetonius *Domitianus* 15 p. 323
Synesius of Ptolemais *ep.* **lxvi** p. 205
Tatian *oratio ad Graecos* 22, 23 p. 327
Tertullian *ad martyras* 1 p. 399; 3 p. 344
—— *ad Scapulam* 2 p. 220; 3 p. 355; 4 p. 325; 5 p. 220
—— *ad uxorem* **i** 1 p. 404; 4 p. 404: **ii** 3 p. 404; 4 p. 342; 5 p. 354; 8 p. 21; 9 pp. 354, 404
—— *adversus Marcionem* **i** 14 pp. 349, 352; **iii** 22 p. 350; **iv** 5 pp. 128, 129, 201; 9 p. 359; **v** 4 p. 38
—— *adversus Praxean* 2 pp. 344, 345; 26 pp. 345, 346, 349
—— *adversus Valentinum* 4 pp. 291, 300
—— *apologeticus* 5 p. 325; 6 p. 404; 22, 23 pp. 329, 341, 342; 29 p. 322; 30 p. 325; 35 p. 329; 37 pp. 220, 325; 38 pp. 323, 327, 328; 39 pp. 27, 221; 42 pp. 325, 327; 43 p. 329; 46 pp. 323, 356, 358
—— *de anima* 35 p. 343; 51 p. 355; 57 p. 329
—— *de baptismo* pp. 377, 390, 393; 2 p. 346; 4 p. 342; 6 p. 35; 7 pp. 342, 349; 8 p. 350; 13 p. 346; 15 pp. 35, 152, 256; 16 p. 331; 17 pp. 223, 304, 381, 390, 391, 392, 393; 18 pp. 352, 353; 19 p. 340; 20 pp. 341, ?
—— *de carne Christi* 5 p. 344

Tertullian *de corona militis* 3 pp. 340, 341, 343, 344, 349, 352, 355, 358, 394; 11 pp. 322, 324, 325, 326, 350; 13 pp. 343, 404
—— *de cultu feminarum* i 2 p. 343
—— *de exhortatione castitatis* 7 pp. 21, 221, 222, 385, 397; 11 pp. 355, 396
—— *de fuga* 14 p. 21
—— *de idololatria* 1, 2 p. 374; 6 p. 343; 8 p. 322; 9 p. 329; 10 p. 327; 11 pp. 323, 374; 14 p. 340; 16 p. 404; 17, 18 pp. 323, 324; 19 pp. 324, 326, 350
—— *de ieiunio* 2 p. 342; 13 pp. 223, 342; 14 pp. 341, 342
—— *de monogamia* 1 p. 28; 7 p. 37; 10 p. 355; 11 pp. 221, 304, 404; 12 pp. 221, 382
—— *de oratione* 2 pp. 37, 239; 18 pp. 340, 342; 19 p. 354
—— *de paenitentia* p. 341; 4 p. 374; 7 pp. 366, 367, 373; 8 p. 369; 9 pp. 369, 372, 373; 10 pp. 21, 369; 11 p. 369; 12 p. 374
—— *de pallio* 5 pp. 323, 324
—— *de pudicitia* 1 pp. 359, 367, 374, 404; 2 p. 375; 3 pp. 367, 375; 4 p. 404; 5 pp. 369, 372; 6 p. 346; 7 pp. 328, 397; 9 pp. 344, 360; 11 pp. 221, 372, 373; 12 p. 374; 13 p. 369; 18 pp. 375, 397; 19 pp. 358, 359, 375; 20 p. 39; 21 pp. 27, 35, 273, 375; 22 p. 399
—— *de resurrectione carnis* 8 pp. 349, 350
—— *de spectaculis* 2 p. 322; 4 pp. 327, 343; 5–15 p. 328; 13 pp. 327, 341; 16 p. 324; 16–22 p. 328; 20 p. 328; 24 pp. 327, 343; 25 p. 352
—— *de virginibus velandis* 1 pp. 344, 345; 9 pp. 382, 392; 11 p. 404
—— *praescriptio adversus haereticos* 3 p. 304; 13 pp. 337, 345, 358; 20 pp. 47, 106, 345; 21 pp. 47, 219; 22 p. 48; 23 p. 344; 28 pp. 48, 107; 30 pp. 361, 373; 32 pp. 48, 201, 222; 36 pp. 303, 344; 37 p. 221; 40 p. 350; 41 pp. 31, 40, 223, 304, 330, 386, 388, 393; [pseudo-Tert.] 51 p. 362
Testamentum Domini (or *Testament of our Lord*) pp. 271, 278, 280, 281, 288, 289, 297, 302, 311, 312, 382
Theodoret *historia ecclesiastica* i 4 p. 335
Theophilus of Alexandria, *epistula* p. 172: *canones* p. 208
Theophilus of Antioch *ad Autolycum* iii 15 p. 327
Ulpian: see *Digest*
Vincent of Lerins *Commonitorium* 6 p. 153; 8, 21, 22 p. 45
Zenophilum, Gesta apud, 10 pp. 300, 306

INDEX OF REFERENCES

C. MODERN AUTHORITIES

Achelis, H. *Die Canones Hippolyti* (*Die ältesten Quellen des orientalischen Kirchenrechts* 1): in *Texte und Untersuchungen* vi. 1891. 312

Adam, K. *Der Kirchenbegriff Tertullians*: in Ehrhard und Kirsch *Forschungen*. 1907. 27, 35

d'Alès, A. *Tertullien et Calliste*: in *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* xiii. 1912. 375

Ammundsen, V. *The Rule of Truth in Irenaeus*: in *Journal of Theological Studies* xiii (also in *Teologisk Tidsskrift*). 1912. 52

Barthoulot, J., and Tixeront, J. *Saint Irénée: Démonstration de la prédication apostolique*. 1917. 333

Batiffol, P. *L'Église naissante et le Catholicisme*. 1909. [English translation, 1911.] 49, 50, 51, 236, 243, 252

—— *Études d'histoire et théologie positive*. 1904. 374, 375

Benson, E. W. *Cyprian*. 1897. 141, 152, 154, 244, 252, 261, 346, 347, 387, 399, 400

Bernard, J. H. *The Pastoral Epistles*. 1899. 394

—— *Studia Sacra*. 1917. 394

Bickell, G. *Geschichte des Kirchenrechts*. 1843. 302

Bingham, J. *Antiquities of the Christian Church*. 1708–22. 353, 360

Boudinhon, A. *La* Missa Poenitentium *en occident*: in *Revue d'histoire et de littérature religieuses* vii. 1902. 367

Brightman, F. E. *The Sacramentary of Serapion of Thmuis*: in *Journal of Theological Studies* i. 1899, 1900. 298

Brooke, A. E. *Fragments of Heracleon*: in *Texts and Studies* i 4. 1891. 11

Brooks, E. W. *Select Letters of Severus, Patriarch of Antioch*: in *Text and Translation Society*. 1902–1904. 172, 211

Burkitt, F. C. *Early Eastern Christianity*. 1904. 40

Burnet, J. *Early Greek Philosophy*. Ed. 2. 1908. 198

Butler, E. C. *The Lausiac History of Palladius*: in *Texts and Studies* vi. 1898. 87

Cabrol, F. *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie*: see Leclercq, H.

—— and Leclercq, H. *Monumenta Ecclesiae Liturgica* i. 1913. 312

Chapman, J. *On the* de unitate *of St Cyprian*: in *Revue Bénédictine*. 1903. 242, 251, 252

—— *On H. Koch* Cyprian und der römische Primat: *ib.* 1910. 245

Chase, F. H. *Confirmation in the Apostolic Age.* 1909. 31
Connolly, R. H. *The Liturgical Homilies of Narsai*: in *Texts and Studies* viii 1. 1909. 351
—— *The so-called Egyptian Church Order*: *ib.* viii 4. 1916. 312, 320, 354
Cooper, J., and Maclean, A. J. *The Testament of our Lord.* 1902. 312
Diels, H. *Doxographi Graeci.* 1879. 197, 198, 199
Duchesne, L. *Le concile d'Elvire*: in *Mélanges Renier.* 1887. 376
—— *Origines du culte chrétien.* Ed. 3. 1903. 347
—— *Églises séparées.* 1896. 347
Elwin, W. *The Minister of Baptism.* 1889. 255
Frere, W. H. *Early Ordination Services*: in *Journal of Theological Studies* xvi. 1915. 268, 271, 312
Friedländer, L. *Roman Life and Manners.* 1908. [E. T. of ed. 7 of *Darstellungen aus der Sittengeschichte Roms.*] 328
Funk, F. X. *Hermae Pastor*: in *Patres Apostolici.* Ed. 2. 1901. 19
—— *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum.* 1905. 280, 312, 320
Galtier, P. *La consignation à Carthage et à Rome*: in *Recherches de science religieuse* iv. 1911. 350
Gore, C. *The Church and the Ministry.* 402
Harnack, A. *Die Gesellschaftsverfassung der christlichen Kirchen.* 1883. [Translation of E. Hatch *The Organization* etc.] 60
—— *Die Lehre der zwölf Apostel*: in *Texte und Untersuchungen* ii. 1884. 60, 61–66, 302
—— *Dogmengeschichte* (E. T. of ed. 3, *History of Dogma*, 1894). 1886. [ed. 4. 1909] 19, 23, 31, 46, 49, 51
—— *On the* de unitate *of St Cyprian* (*Theologische Literaturzeitung*). 1903. 252
—— *Entstehung und Entwickelung der Kirchenverfassung und des Kirchenrechts in den zwei ersten Jahrhunderten* (E.T. *Constitution and Law of the Church in the first two centuries*, 1910). 1910. 6, 9, 32, 60, 227
—— *Ein Jüdisch-Christliches Psalmbuch* [i.e. Odes of Solomon]: in *Texte und Untersuchungen* [III v=] xxxv. 1910. 8
Harris, J. Rendel. *Odes and Psalms of Solomon.* 1909. 8
Hartel, W. *S. Cypriani Opera* iii. 1871. 331
Hatch, E. *The Organization of the Early Christian Churches.* Ed. 2. 1882. [And see Harnack, A.] 60, 84, 113, 174, 403
Hauler, E. *Didascaliae Apostolorum Fragmenta Veronensia Latina.* 1900. 274, 280, 312
Hefele, C. J. (see also Leclercq, H.). *History of the Councils.* 1871. [E. T. of *Conciliengeschichte* 1855–74.] 360
Horner, G. *The Statutes of the Apostles or Canones Ecclesiastici.* 1904. 289, 302, 312
Hort, F. J. A. *The Christian Ecclesia.* 1897. 6, 21, 29, 41
—— *The First Epistle of St Peter.* 1898. 8
—— *The Epistle of St James.* 1909. 8
—— (see also Mayor, J. B.).
Jenkins, C. *Origen on* 1 *Corinthians*: in *Journal of Theological Studies* ix. 1908. 324

Koch, H. *Cyprian und der römische Primat*: in *Texte und Untersuchungen*, series III, no. V [=XXXV]. 1910. 245, 246, 248–250, 253, 258, 262
Labriolle, P. de. *La crise Montaniste*. 1913. 273
—— *Les sources de l'histoire du Montanisme*. 1913. 273
Lagarde, P. A. de. *Reliquiae iuris ecclesiastici antiquissimae*. 1856. 304, 312
Lawlor, H. J. *Eusebiana*. 1912. 115, 273
Leclercq, H. *Baptême de Jésus*: in F. Cabrol's *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie* ii 1. 1910. 348
—— *Carthage*: *ib.* ii 2. 1910. 218, 219
—— *Histoire des conciles* (French translation of Hefele *Conciliengeschichte*, with added notes). 1907. 326
Liddon, H. P. *A Father in Christ*. 1885. 112
Lightfoot, J. B. *Dissertation on the Christian Ministry* (appended to *The Epistle to the Philippians*). 1868. 59, 79–87, 90, 218, 221, 229
—— *The Apostolic Fathers: S. Ignatius*. 1883. 24, 255
—— *The Apostolic Fathers: S. Clement*. 1890. 11, 12, 45, 112, 118, 323
Lipsius, R. A. *Valentinus*: in Smith and Wace *Dictionary of Christian Biography* iv. 1887. 11
Lupton, J. H. *Tertullian* de Baptismo. 1908. 35
Maclean, A. J. *The Ancient Church Orders*: in *Cambridge Handbooks for Liturgical Study*. 1910. 268
Marquardt, J. *Römische Staatsverwaltung* i: in *Handbuch der römischen Alterthümer* vol. iv. 1873. 323
—— *op. cit.* iii: *ib.* vol. vi. 1878. 322
—— *Privatleben* i: *ib.* vol. vii. 1879. 327
Mayor, J. B. (and Hort, F. J. A.). *Clement of Alexandria: The Seventh Book of the* Stromateis. 1902. 15
Mommsen, Th. *Römisches Staatsrecht* ii: in *Handbuch der römischen Alterthümer* vol. i part 2. Ed. 3, 1887. 323
Morinus, J. *Commentarius de sacris ecclesiae Ordinationibus*. 1655. 209
Nau, F. *La version syriaque de l'*Octateuque *de Clément*: in *Ancienne littérature canonique syriaque* iv. 1913. 312
Neander, A. *History of the Christian Religion and Church*. [E. T. of *Allgemeine Geschichte der christlichen Religion und Kirche*. 1825–52.] 33
Petschenig, M. *S. Augustini scripta contra Donatistas*: in the Vienna *Corpus script. eccl. lat.* li–liii. 1908–1910. 181
Phillimore, J. S. *Philostratus* In honour of Apollonius of Tyana. 1912. 112
Preuschen, E. *Valentinus*: in Herzog-Hauck *Realencyklopädie*. 1896. 11
Puller, F. W. *The Primitive Saints and the See of Rome*. Ed. 3. 1900. 175
Rahmani, Mar I. E. *Testamentum Domini nostri Iesu Christi*. 1899. 312
Riedel, W. *Die Kirchenrechtsquellen des Patriarchats Alexandrien*. 1900. 312
Robinson, J. A. *The Doxology*: in *Expositor* v 9. 1899. 280
—— *The problem of the* Didache: in *Journal of Theological Studies* xiii. 1912. 60
Rogers, C. F. *Baptism and Christian archaeology*: in *Studia Biblica* v. 1903. 347, 348

Saltet, L. *Les réordinations: étude sur le sacrement de l'Ordre.* 1907. 159, 174
Schwartz, E. *Ueber die pseudoapostolischen Kirchenordnungen.* 1910. 265
Sohm, R. *Kirchenrecht.* 1892. 6, 9, 10, 20–22, 32
—— *Wesen und Ursprung des Katholizismus.* 1909. 9, 30, 32
Swete, H. B. *The Apocalypse of St John.* 1906. 12
—— *The Holy Spirit in the ancient Church.* 1912. 34
Tattam, H. *Apostolical Constitutions or Canons of the Apostles.* 1848. 312
Taylor, C. *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, with illustrations from the Talmud.* 1886. 71, 72
Thompson, T. *The Offices of Baptism and Confirmation.* 1914. 351
Turner, C. H. *Ecclesiae Occidentalis Monumenta Iuris Antiquissima* I. 2. 1904. 141, 209
—— *The Organisation of the Church*: in *Cambridge Medieval History* i. 1911. 23, 147, 226, 232, 236, 402
—— *The Ordination Prayer for a presbyter in the* Church Order *of Hippolytus*: in *Journal of Theological Studies* xvi. 1915. 284
Tyrrell, G., *Autobiography and Life of.* 1912. 22
Westcott, B. F. *The Epistles of St John.* 1883. 318
Wordsworth, J. *Bishop Sarapion's Prayer-Book.* 1899. 298

II

INDEX OF GREEK AND LATIN TERMS

agape, *ἀγάπη* 255 n. 2, 330, 354, 395 n. 4
amen, *ἀμήν* 352 and n. 1, 407
anaphora 294, 297
apostolus, *ὁ ἀπόστολος* 103, **401 n. 3**
arca 354 and n. 1
audientes 331 and n. 3
ἀκροᾶσθαι 339 n. 6, 368 notes 1, 2
ἀρχιερεύς, ἀρχιερατεύειν, ἀρχιερατικός **129 n. 2, n. 3**, 279, 280 n. 2, 304 and n. 2, 381, 388 n. 4

benedictio **350 n. 1**, 354 n. 5, 384, 404 and n. 1, 405 and n. 3

canon, *κανών*, canonicus, canonizatus 51, 52, 334, **358 n.**, 371 n. 5
capitalia delicta 359 and n. 1
capsa 220 n. 4
cathedra, *καθέδρα* 105, 107, 108, 124 n. 1, 248, 251 n., 303 n. 4, 385 and n. 6
catholica, *καθολική* 24, 25, 26, 185 n. 1, 188 n. 1, 244 n. 3, 249 and notes, 295 n. 1, 335
charisma, *χάρισμα* 30–33, 46, 50, 64–66, 72–76, 78, 79, 88, 107, 108, 127, 265 and n. 2, 266 and n. 1, 268, 272, 274, 293, 307, 406
chrisma, *χρῖσμα, χρίεσθαι* 167 and n. 3, 169 and n. 1, 349, 350 n. 2, n. 3, 393 and n. 5, 405 and n. 5
clerus, *κλῆρος* 166 n. 1, 173 n., 177, 230 n. 1, 238 n. 3, 279, 280 n. 2, 289 n., 290 n. 2, 348 n. 4, 372 n. 2, 373 n. 6, **381 n. 4**, 392 n. 2, 398
cognitio 364 n. 3, 365
collegium (1) of bishops 226: (2) of bishop and presbyters 386
communicatio 249, 361 n. 12, 372 n. 2: *and see* ius
compresbyteri 385 n. 5
confessor 290 n. 2
consessus 221 n. 4, 385 and notes
consignare 349, 350, 393 n. 5
consistentes 368, 371
κηρύσσειν 388 n. 1
χειροθεσία, χειροθετεῖν, χεῖρας ἐπιτιθέναι 168 n. 1, **177**, 208, 210, 266 and n. 1, n. 2, 405 n. 3
χειροτονία, χειροτονεῖν 161 n., 171 n. 1, 176, 179 n. 1, 208, 210, 266 and n. 4, 282 n. 1, 378 n. 1, 402 n. § 2

doctor 225, 229, 304: doctor audientium 320 n. 2, 331 and n. 3: presbyter doctor 236, 302 and n. 2
διαδοχή, διαδέχεσθαι, διάδοχος 111 n., 117 and n. 2, 118 and n. 1, n. 2, 120 n. 1, 123 n., 129, 131, **133–137**, 139, 142, **197–206**, 207, 304 n. 2
διανυκτέρευσις 342 n. 3
διδάσκαλος, διδασκαλία 295 n. 1, 304 n. 2
διδάσκειν 331 n. 2
δικαστήρια 364 n. 3

ecclesia, *ἐκκλησία* **5–7**, 20, 21, 76, 127
episcopus, *ἐπίσκοπος, ἐπισκοπή* 83, 84, 113, 141 n. 1, 276 and n., 279, 280 and n. 2
exomologesis, *ἐξομολόγησις* 357 and n. 4, 369 and n. 6, **372** and n. 2, n. 5, 373, 377, 384, 398
exorcizare, *ἐξορκίζειν* 341 n. 4
ἐξουσία 280 n. 2, 371 n. 3, 396 n. 3, 406 and **n. 2**
ἐπερωτήσεις καὶ ἀποκρῖσεις 344 n. 2
εὐλογία 405 n. 3
ἐφόδιον 354 n. 11

gnosis, *γνῶσις* 49, 126–127
γόνυ κλίνειν 339 n. 6

interrogationes ac responsiones 344 n. 2, 346 n. 6
iudicium 231, 364 n. 3, 384
ius 191 n. 1, 390 n. 1, 392 n. 3, 406 n. 2: ius canonicum 362: ius communicationis 373 and n. 6, 379, 384: ius communionis 241 n.

ἱερεύς 227, 395: *ἱερουργεῖν* 227 and n. 1: *ἱερουργία* 284 n. 2, 285

laicus, *λαϊκός* 110, 222 and n. 2, 223 n. 3, 392 n. 3, 397 n. 1
lapsi 149, 235, 361, 362, 365, 371, 399, 400
lector 331 n. 3
lex 187 n., 358 n.
libelli, libellatici 376, 399

maiores natu 381 n. 2, 400
martyr, *μάρτυς* 290 and **n 2,** 399 n. 1, n. 2, 400
missa catechumenorum 330 n. 4, 331, 342, 367: paenitentium 367 and n. 3
μετάνοια 366 notes 3, 4, 5

in nomine Iesu Christi 160 n. 1, 166 n. 2, **346 and n. 6**
νόμος 358 n. 1

obsignare 354 n. 5, 404 n. 1
offerre, oblatio 222 n. 1, n. 2, 237 and n. 2, 354 n. 5, 385 n. 1, 394, 395, 396 and n. 3, 404 n. 1
ordinare, ordinatio 130 n. 1, 131 n. 3, 161 n., 168 and n. 1, 175 and n. 1, 185 n. 1, 229 n. 1, 233 n. 1, 381 n. 2
ordo (1) succession 129 n. 1, 206: (2) clergy as opposed to people 221, 225 and n. 4, 372, 380: (3) order or rank among the clergy 171 n. 2, 406 and n. 3
ὁμολογία 343 n. 5, *ὁμόλογοι* 290 n. 2
ὅρος 358 n. 1

paenitentia 366 and notes 3, 4, 6
parasceve, *παρασκευή* 341
pascha, *πάσχα* 342 and n. 3
pentecoste, *πεντηκοστή* 340 and n. 3
perfundere 347, 348 and n. 2
plebs 221 and n. 4, 225, 239, 365, 372
potestas **131 n. 2,** 180 n., 247 n. 2, 381 n. 2, **406 and n. 2**
praepositus 350 n. 1, **394 n. 3**
praesidens 381 n. 2, **394 n. 3**
presbyter, *πρεσβύτερος* **84,** 124 and n. 1, 223, 236, 276 and n., 282 n. 1, 284 n. 2: *and see* doctores
psychici, *ψυχικοί* 27, 33

παννυχίς 342 n. 3
παρασυναγωγαί 151 n. 2, 168 n. 2
περιχέειν 348 and notes 2, 4
πομπή 343 n. 1
προεστώς 394 and n. 3
προσφέρειν 396 n. 3
προσφωνεῖν 388 n. 1
πρωτοκαθεδρία, πρωτοκαθεδρῖται 385 and notes 6, 10

regula **358 and n.**

sacerdos 186 n. 2, 221, 222 n. 2, 386 n. 2, 396: of bishops **226,** 228 and notes, 229 notes 1, 2, 3, 230 and n. 4, 231 and n. 2, 232, 239 and n. 1: of presbyters 223, 226, **395 and n. 8**: of laity 221, 222 n. 1, **397 n. 1**: metaphorical 324 n. 9: sacerdotalis 223 and n. 1, 226, 250 n. 1, 391 n. 3, 392 n. 5: sacerdotium 222, 223, 226, 232, 237, 238, 286 n. 2: summus sacerdos 180 and n., 223 and n. 3, 228, 304 n. 2, 381 and n. 1, 390 n. 1
sacramentum 191 n. 1, 242 n. 1, 246 n. 1, 325, **377 n. 2**: of the military oath 325 and n. 2
signaculum 325, 350 n. 1
succedere, successio, successor 124 n. 2, 130 n. 1, 131 n. 2, 143, **200–206,** 247 n. 3
suffragium 231 and n. 2
συμπρεσβύτερος 385 n. 5, cf. 248 n. 5
συνεστάναι 368 n. 4
σφραγίς, σφραγίζειν 178, 350 and n. 2, cf. 54

thlibomeni, *θλιβόμενοι* 354 n. 6
tinguere 222 n. 1, n. 2, 345 and n. 2, 346, 347, 348, 392 n. 5, 397 n. 1
tractare 229 n. 4
traditor 149, 186, 300
θεσμός 358 n.
θρόνος 136 and n., 303 and n. 3, n. 5 304, 385 and n. 6, n. 9
τεσσερακοστή 340 and n. 2, 341 n. 1

uiaticum 354
ungere, unctio 342 n. 8
ὑπηρέτης 387 n. 3, 388 n. 10
ὑποπίπτειν 368 n. 3

III

INDEX OF PROPER NAMES

Abercius of Hieropolis 54
Acacius of Constantinople 175 and notes
Adamantius 25, 204
Africa, churches of 53, 55, 150, 153, 154, 159, 162 n., 178, 180–181, 182, 183 n., 184, 211, **218–220**, 222, 225, 227, 242, 243, 248, 258, 262, 371, 374, 375, 399: creed of 36 n. 5, 259 and n. 5, 344 n. 4: usages of 256, 331 n. 3, 343, 349, 352 n. 1, n. 2, 369, 388, 389, 398: councils of 153, 226, *and see* Carthage
Agabus 80
Agapetus of Rome 178
Agrippinus of Carthage 152 n. 2, 153 and n. 4, 220, 256, 257
Alexander Severus, emperor, 300, 322
Alexander of Alexandria 335, 361
Alexander of Antioch 167, 171
Alexander of Byzantium 335
Alexander of Jerusalem 299, 307 n. 1
Alexander of Rome 123, 139
Alexander, Montanist 362
Alexander, heretic 267
Alexandria, church of 55, 157, 167, 176, 218, 250: its foundation 137, **138**, 141: its episcopal succession **135–140**: special position of presbyters 86 n., 306, **402 n.** § 3: parishes 387 and n. 1: catechetical school 332 n. 3: councils at (c. A.D. 321) 361; (A.D. 362) 171, **173**, 174, 185 n. 1
Amastris, church of 374
Ambrose of Milan 172, 187 n., 299, 307 n. 1
Ambrosiaster 141 n. 1, 205, 393 n. 5, 396
Anastasius 11–12
Anastasius I of Rome 172 n.
Anastasius II of Rome 175
Anatolius of Laodicea 133
Ancyra, council of (A.D. 314) 362, 370, 376, 388 n. 1, 402 n. § 2: *for its* canons *see* p. 414
Anencletus (Cletus) of Rome 123, 142 n. 2
Anicetus of Rome 117 and n. 2, 118 and n. 2, 123, 207, 394
Annianus of Alexandria 136, 138, 140, 141
Antinous 207
Antioch, church of 80, 132, 170, **171**, 172, 218, 250: its foundation 137, 138, 139, 141, 142 n. 1: its episcopal succession **135–140**: school of 210: council at (c. A.D. 269) 361
Antonianus, Numidian bishop, 249
Antoninus Pius, emperor, 100, 207, 217
Apelles, Marcionite 53
Apollonius, anti-Montanist 290 n. 2
Apollonius, Meletian bishop of Oxyrhynchus 174 n. 1
Arabia, churches of 53
Aristides, apologist 322 n. 1, 333 n. 1
Arius 361: *for* Arianism *see* p. 436
Arles, council of (A.D. 314) 159, 180, 184, 326 and n. 2, 362, 377, 396
Asia (Asia Minor), churches of 53, 85, 86, 88, 120, 121, 123, 152, 361, 362: councils of 361: usages of **367–368**, 370, 388
Assuras 162 n., 185
Astorga 162 n.
Athanasius of Alexandria 158 and n., 169 n. 2, 171, 173 and n., 174, 306, 402 n. § 3
Athenians 6, 9
Augustine of Canterbury 106
Augustine 10, 39, 52 n., 122, 127, 130, 142, 153 n. 4, **206**, 218, 256 n. 4: on non-catholic sacraments 95, **144–146**, 151, 159 n. 2, 160, 164, 170, 174, 175, 178, **179–194**, 195,

209 n. 3: on Cyprian 53, 181, 182, 184, 188, 241 n.: comparison with Severus of Antioch 211–214
Aurelius, confessor 230, 291
Auxentius of Milan 172

Bardaisan (Bardesanes) 40 n. 2
Barnabas, St 49, 83, 307 n. 1
Basil of Cappadocian Caesarea **151 n. 2, 157 and n.**, 158, 164, **168-169**, 181
Basilides, gnostic 98
Basilides, Spanish bishop 162 n.
Biltha in Africa 395, 397
Bithynian Christians 360 n. 7
Bonosus of Sardica 163, 209
Burgundian clergy 178
Byzantium 335

Caecilian of Carthage 149, 150, 184, 185 n. 1, 186, 209 and n. 3
Caecilius, African bishop 395, 397
Caesarea in Cappadocia 130, 156, 202, 256, 381
Caesarea in Palestine, school of 332 n. 3: creed and usages of 334, 335 n. 2, 343, 350, 365
Callistus of Rome 31 n. 3, 39, **155 and n.**, 300, 361, **374–375**, 399
Canterbury, church of 106
Cappadocia 299, 346 n. 6, 372 n. 1
Carthage (*and see* Africa): church of **217, 218**, 220, 224, 236, 241, 305, 376: parishes 387 and n. 1, 402 n. § 1: councils of (c. A.D. 210–220?) 153, 220, 256; (A.D. 251) 242, 361, 377 n. 1, 400; (A.D. 255) 257; (A.D. 256) 130, 240, 254, 257, 262, 395; (conference of A.D. 411) 170 n.
Cassino, Monte 393 n. 5
Cava, La 393 n. 5
Celerinus, confessor 291
Celestine of Rome 206
Celsus 17 n. 2, 23 n. 2, 100, 324, 329
Cerdo (Cerdon) 116 n., 117, 142 n. 2, 200, 361, 373 n. 7
Chalcedon, council of (A.D. 451) 175, 213
Chrysostom, John 171 and n. 1
Cirta (Constantina) 193, 300, 306
Clarus, African bishop **130, 131, 202**
Clement of Alexandria 8, **15–19**, 26, 29, 36, **49**, 50, **51**, 100, **115 n.**, 133, 134, 138 n., 151, 152, 201, 256, 282 n. 1, 325, 405 n. 5
Clement of Rome 48, 123, 139, 140, [382 n.]: epistle to the Corinthians 31, 43, 110, 117: its contents 8, 100: on the ministry 29 n. 5, 30 n. 2, **110–114**, 119, 199, **394 and n. 1**
II Clement **11, 12**
Cleobius 116
Colluthus 169 n. 2, **402 n. § 4**
Constantine, emperor, 182
Constantinople, church of 158, 169 n. 2, 175: councils of (A.D. 381) [158], 169 n. 2, [178]; (A.D. 691) 257 n. 5
Constantius, emperor, 173
Corinth, church of 23, 31, 80, 89, 91, 110, 117: *see also* Clement of Rome
Cornelius of Rome 39, 162 n., 163 n. 1, 168 n. 1, 203, 226, 231, 235, 243, 249, 300, 301, 305 and n. 2, 306, 348 n. 2, n. 4, 350 n. 2, 378 n. 1, 402 n. § 5
Crete 85
Cyprian of Carthage 132, 154 n., **224**, 306, 395, 402 n. § 1: his writings 225, 242, 333 n. 1, 339: on the faith 51: on custom 153: history and usages of the African church 218, 343, 348 n. 2, 353 and n. 7: on the Church 38: on discipline 39, 359–360, 364 n. 3, 365, 369, 372 notes, 399: on schism 36, 143, 182, 195, 360, 361: on non-catholic baptism 20 n. 2, 156–157, 166, 181 n. 2, 212, **256–261**: on other non-catholic sacraments **143–145**, 161, 163 and n. 2: on choice of bishops **230–232**, 300: on bishops **383–384**: presbyters 236–238, 302: minor orders 305: on the ministry 31 n. 3, **130–131, 140–141** and n. 1, **202**, 225–242, 247, 259, 291: unworthy ministers 125, 162 n., 185, 229, 232, 261: on unity 53, **242–250, 253–255**, 258, 260: on the Roman church 142 and n. 2, 244, 245 n., 250: his controversy with Rome 179 and n. 2, 260–262, 346 n. 6:

Augustine and Cyprian 181, 184, 188, 241 n.
Cyril of Jerusalem 331 n. 3, 333 n. 2, 337 n. 3

Decius, emperor: persecution under **149**, 224, 234, 291, **292**, 361, 362, 370, 376, 377 n. 1, **399**
Diocletian, emperor: persecution under (the 'Great Persecution') 132, 134, **149**, 326, 361, 362, 370, 376 n. 3
Diodore of Tarsus 210
Dionysius the Areopagite 278 n. 3
Dionysius of Alexandria 53 n. 1, 132, 133, 153 and n. 2, **157**, 256, 368 n. 4, 371 n. 1, 377 n. 1, 402 n. § 3
Dionysius of Corinth 207, 361, 374
Dionysius of Milan 172
Dionysius of Rome 51
Domitian, emperor, 207, 323
Donatus of Carthage 225
Donatus, founder of Donatism 184, 185 n. 1: *for* Donatists *see* p. 440
Dositheus 116

Egypt, churches of 54, 169 n. 2, 176, 402 n. § 4: creed of 335: usages of 352 n. 2, 354 n. 10, 368 n. 4, 377 n. 1, 393 n. 5, 402 n. § 4
Elagabalus, emperor, 322
Eleutherus of Rome 117, 118 n. 2, 121, 123, 139, 140, 207
Eliberis, *see* Elvira
Elvira, council of (c. A.D. 300) 301, 305, 324, 329, 362, 376 and n. 3, 378 n. 2, 392: *for its* canons *see* p. 414
Ephesus, church of 29, 42, 85, 91, 123
Ephrem Syrus 204
Epiphanius of Salamis 115 n., **118**, 122, 205, 273 n. 2
Euarestus of Rome 123
Euodius of Antioch 140, 141
Euphrates 54
Eusebius of Palestinian Caesarea 9, 115 and n., 117, 118 n. 2, 119, 121, **132–140**, 141, 142 n. 1, 147, **203–204**, **207**, 334, **335** and n. 2
Eusebius of Rome 300
Eustathius of Antioch 171
Eutyches 213
Evagrius of Antioch 171

Fabian of Rome 235, 247, 299, 300, 303 n. 5, 307 n. 1
Felicissimus, deacon at Carthage 242 n. 2, 252, 361, 402 n. § 1
Felicitas, martyr 219 n. 2
Felix III of Rome 175 and n. 1
Felix of Aptunga 186
Firmilian of Cappadocian Caesarea **130**, **131**, 153 n. 1, 156, 161 and n., 163, 166, **202**, 210, 247 n. 2, 256, 257, 273 n. 2, 346 n. 6, 378 n. 2, **381 and n. 2**, 390, 400
Flavian emperors 99
Flavius Clemens 323
Fortunatianus of Assuras 162 n., 185
Fortunatus, schismatical bishop at Carthage 234

Gaius, Roman presbyter 369 n. 6
Gallienus, emperor: peace of 132, 325
Gaul, churches of 53, 120, 121, 178: *see also* Lyons
Gelasius of Rome 175 and n. 1
Generosus, layman of Cirta 192
Genesius (*or* Gelasinus), legend of 192 n. 1
George, Arian bishop of Alexandria 174 n. 1
Germany, churches of 54
Gratus of Carthage 183 n.
Gregory the Great of Rome 106, 393 n. 5
Gregory Nazianzen 205
Gregory Thaumaturgus of Neocaesarea 362, 368 n. 1
Gregory, Monophysite bishop 213 n. 3

Hadrian, emperor, 100, 137, 199, 207, 217
Hegesippus 45 n. 5, 54, 95, 100, **115–120**, 122, 129, 133, 137, 196, **199–200**, **207**
Heraclas of Alexandria 402 n. § 3
Heracleon, gnostic 11 and n. 1
Hermas **12–15**, 19, 36, 39, 100, 103, **115**, 333 n. 1, 374
Hippolytus 39 and n. 1, **48 and n. 3**, 51, 121, 122, 127, **129**, 131 and n. 2,

140 n. 2, 155 and **n., 202**: his 'Church Order' **268–269**, 273 n. 4, 303, 304, 308, **320 (and n. 1)**, **331**, **339–345**, **349**, **351–353**, 378 n. 1, 381, 386, 388, 389, 393, **400–401**: his rigorism 149, 157, 322, **375**: on unchristian professions 322–330: on the Creed 335 n. 1, **344 and n. 4**
Hosius of Cordova 183 n.
Hyginus of Rome 123, 142 and **n. 2**, 361
Hymenaeus 267

Iconium, council of (c. A.D. 230) 152, 153 and n. 1, 256
Ignatius, second bishop of Antioch 139, 140, 141: his letters 29, 43, 54, 97, 100, 102, **113–115**, 119, 120, 227: on the bishop and unity 113, 229: on the bishop and the sacraments 238, 239, 255 and n. 2, 390–391, 394, 395 and n. 4, 404 and n. 2
Innocent I of Rome 163 and n. 3, 164, 167, 168 and n. 1, 171 n. 2, 208–209, 405 n. 5
Irenaeus of Lyons: his date and history 100, **120–121**, 207: his *Epideixis* 333 n. 2: his *Adversus Haereses* 121–122: on the Rule of Faith 51, 52 n., 334, 358 n.: on the Church 8, 34, 35, 37: on the Successions **45–47**, 48, 49, 95, 106, 114, 118, 119, 120, **122–127**, 129, 131, 134 and n. 1, 193, 196, **200–201**: on the Roman Succession 123, 140, 142 n. 2: on the Successions in relation to doctrine 133, 229, in relation to non-catholic sacraments 146, 148, 151, 156, 183, 195: on unworthy ministers 125, 185: on infant baptism 352: on unity 54, and diversity 53, 121
Ischyras 402 n. § 4
Italy 162 n., 323, 375

James of Jerusalem 8, 109, 116, 134: bishop 49, 85, 86, 88, 120, 133, 136 n., 138 and n., 303
James the son of Zebedee 49, 138 n.
Jannes and Jambres 267, 272
Jerome 40 n. 1, 115 n., 135 n.: on the Successions 139, 142, **205**: *Dial. adv. Luciferianos* 163 n. 2, 165 n. 1, 173, **179–180**, 208: on bishops and presbyters 255 n. 3, 276 n., 303, 402 n. § 3: on deacons 396
Jerusalem, fall of 86, 109: second siege of 137: church of 85, 86, 88, 116, 117, 133, **135–138**, 254, 299–300, 303, 307 n. 1
John, St 49, 134, 138 n.: in Asia Minor 29, 49, 85, 86, 88, 124, 128–129: Gospel of 4, 42, 100: Apocalypse of 13, 80, 89, 100
John the presbyter 124 n. 1
Jubaianus, Mauretanian bishop 240
Judas Iscariot 141 and n. 1, 187 and n., 230
Jude, grandsons of St 116
Julian of Halicarnassus 213
Justin Martyr 8, 100, 102, 117, 207, 210, 227, 325 n. 2, 333 n. 1: account of Christian rites 87, 268, 351 n. 2, 378 n. 1, 394 and n. 3

Lactantius 323, 324, 325
Laodicea, council of (c. A.D. 363?) 158 n.: *for its* canons *see* p. 414
Leo I of Rome, 167–168, 174, 213
Leon 162 n.
Liberian chronographer 142
Liberius of Rome 204
Licinius, emperor, 362
Linus of Rome 123, 139, 140, 141, 142
Lucifer of Cagliari 171, 173, 174, 185 and n. 1, 208: *for* Luciferians *see* p. 442
Luke, St 4, 81–83, 104
Luther, Martin 10, 11, 17, 28
Lycopolis 176
Lyons, church of 121: epistle from 37, 290 n. 2

Macedonia, churches of 163, 164, 208–209
Magnesia, church of 114
Marcellina, gnostic 117
Marcellinus of Rome 193 n.
Marcellinus and Faustinus, Luciferian presbyters 174 n. 1
Marcion, gnostic 9, 37, 40 n. 1, 98,

116 n., 117, 142 n. 2, 361, 362, 373 n. 7: *for* Marcionites *see* p. 442
Marcus Aurelius, emperor, 100, 207, 324, 325
Mark, St 4, 104, 138
Mascula in Numidia 130, 202
Matthew, St 4
Matthias, St 141, 230, 266, 281
Maximilian, martyr 325
Maximus, schismatic bishop of Constantinople 169 n. 2
Meletius of Antioch 171, 176 n. 1
Meletius of Lycopolis 176: *for* Meletians *see* p. 442
Milan, edict of 326: church of 172, 180, 307 n. 1
Milvian bridge, battle of 326
Montanus 156, 361: *for* Montanists *see* p. 442
Moses 267, 284 n. 2, 285

Narbonne 174
Narcissus of Jerusalem 133, 136, 137, 299
Neocaesarea in Pontus, council of (c. A.D. 315) 362, 370, 377, 388 n. 10, *for its* canons *see* p. 414
Nero, emperor, 99
Nerva, emperor, 99
Nestorius of Constantinople 213
Nicaea, council of (A.D. 325) 170 n., 173 n., **176–177**, 181 n. 2, 208–210, 334, 335, 341 n. 1, 358 n., 362, 370, 371, 396: on rebaptism 157, 181 n. 2, 212: *for its* canons *see* p. 414
Nicaea, second council of (A.D. 787) 173 n., 177, 210
Niceta of Remesiana 344 n. 4
Nisibis 54
Noetus 361
Novatian (*for* Novatianists *see* p. 442) 39, 143, 149, 154, 155 n., 157, 176, 243, 249, 252, 361, 369, 375: his baptism 378 n. 1; confirmation 378 n. 1; ordination 299, 378 n. 1; consecration 163 n. 1, 168 n. 1, 300–301, 402 n. §§ 1, 5: as writer and theologian 38, 51, 52 n., 327, 328 n. 3
Novatus, presbyter at Carthage 234, 362, 402 n. § 1

Optatus of Mileum 142, 163, **204**
Optatus, confessor 291 n. 2
Origen, his date and times 132, 241, 402 n. § 3, his importance 101, 128, his writings 100, 356 n. 3: on the Church 9, 17 n. 2, 20 n. 1, 39, as spouse of Christ 36–37: the Church and the Apostles **50**, 127–128, 134, **202**: on the ministry 292, 303 n. 4, 307 n. 2, 398 and n. 2: on election of clergy 230 n. 4, 299 n. 1: sacerdotal language 227, 228 n. 7: on unworthy ministers 186 and n. 2, 398: on the catechumenate and catechesis 330 n. 1, n. 4, 332 and notes, 333, **336–338**: on baptismal usages 343, 350 and n. 3: on discipline **355–357**, 358 n., 360, 365, 369, 375–376, 398: on military service 324, 325
Orleans, council of (A.D. 511) 178
Osrhoene 53 n. 1

Pacian of Barcelona 247 n. 2
Palestine, churches of 54, 116, 120, 172
Papias 37 n. 1, 100
Parmenian, Donatist bishop 186, 187
Paul, St 7, 12, 13, 32, 40, 54, 83, 88, 91, 102, 104, 109, 113, 125, 134, 156, 307 n. 1: 'the Apostle' 103, 401 n. 3: his epistles 220 n. 4: on Christ and the Church **4–5**: on the Church and the churches **21–23**: on apostolic authority and teaching **42–45**: on the ministry **64–70**, 227, 281: on *charismata* **72–76**, 78, 79: Pauline churches 124, 128: *and see* Peter and Paul, *and* Pastoral epistles p. 443
Paul of Samosata 132, 157, 208, 212, 361: *and see* Paulianists p. 443
Perpetua, martyr 218, 219 n. 2, 302 n. 2
Peter, St 42, 49, 104, 109, 134, 138 n., 218, 316, [382 n. 1]: Christ's promise to 239, **243–248**: epistle of 8, 32, 42, 103: St Peter and the church of Antioch 138, 139, 140, 141, 142 and n. 1: St Peter and the church of Rome (*see also* Peter and Paul) 139, 140 notes, 141 n. 3, 142 and n. 2, 247–248, 250:

'chair of Peter' 136 n., 248, 251 and n.
Peter and Paul, SS., and the church of Rome 106, 114, 118, 123, 128, 136, **138–140**, 248
Philadelphia, church of 29
Philip of Heraclea 306 n. 1
Philo 72
Phoenicia, churches of 172
Photinus of Sirmium 212
Photius of Constantinople 115 n.
Pionius, martyr 26
Pius, emperor, *see* Antoninus Pius
Pius of Rome 115, 123
Poemen, abbot 86 n.
Polycarp of Smyrna 48, 100, 121, 123, 134 n. 1, 295 n. 1, 394, 404
Polycrates of Ephesus 52
Pontus, churches of 362, 374
Porphyry 341 n. 2
Pothinus of Lyons 121
Proterius of Alexandria 167, 214
Ptolemaeus, gnostic 116 n., **200**
Puppianus, African bishop 130

Revocatus, martyr 219 n. 2
Rhodon 53
Rogatianus, African bishop 240
Roman church: its foundation 138, 140–142, 247–248: its episcopal succession 106, 118, **135–140**, 142 and **n. 2**, **193**, 300, 307 n. 1, 402 n. § 5: presbyters 234–235, 387, 398: its usages 320, 343, 349, 352 n. 1, 367, 378 n. 1, 401 and n. 3: its discipline 369 and n. 6: clergy 302 and n. 5, 305, 389: Creed 102, **334–335**, 335 n. 1, **344** and **n. 4**: its teaching on the Church 55: on the ministry 30 n. 2, 31 n. 3, 120, 238 n. 2, 406 n. 3: on non-catholic baptism **153–155**, **159–161**, 165, **166–168**, 257, **258**, **346**, **n. 6**: on non-catholic orders **168**, **174–175**, 178: disciplinary controversies in 149, 155 n. 1, 243, 268, 361 n. 12, 362, 375, 376, 399: its relation to other churches 110, 217–218, 234–235, 241, 244, 361, 394: relation of the rest of Christendom to 46, 54, 117, 121, 184, 248–249, 250, 254, 257, 262
Rome 54, 117: council of (A.D. 313) 184, 185 n. 1
Rufinus 50 n. 2, 173 n., 186, 209
Russia, church of 236
Rusticus of Narbonne 174

Sabellius 361
Sabinus, Spanish bishop 231
Saragossa, council of (A.D. 592) 178 and n. 2
Sarapion *or* Serapion of Thmuis 204, **297–298**, 299
Sardica *or* Serdica, council of (A.D. 343) 183 n., 306
Sardinia 393 n. 5
Saturus, confessor 291 n. 2
Saturus, martyr 219 n. 2
Scillitan martyrs 219, 220 n. 4
Septimus Severus, emperor: persecution of 121
Serapion of Antioch 201
Serapion of Thmuis: *see* Sarapion
Severus of Antioch 171 n. 2, 172 n., 210, **211–214**
Silvanus of Cirta 193, 300, 306
Simon magus 116
Sinope 362
Siricius of Rome 167
Smyrna, church of 121, 123, 361
Socrates, historian 141
Soter of Rome 117 and n. 2, 123, 124 n. 1
Sozomen, historian 367
Spain, churches of 54, 140, 145 n., 162 n., 167, 178 and n. 2, 362, 370, 376–377, 387 n. 1, 392: creed of 344 n. 4
Stephen, St 288
Stephen of Rome 53, 154, 155 n., 157, 161, 162 n., 166–167, 240, 242, 248, 257, 260, 346 and n. 6, 350 n. 1
Stephen Gobar 115 n.
Symeon of Jerusalem 116, 119
Syncellus, chronicler 135 n., 139
Synesius of Ptolemais 205
Synnada 153 and n. 2
Syria, churches of 40 n. 2, 53 n. 1, 54: usages of 343 and n. 4, 350, 363, 367, 369, 370, 388, 394

Tarasius of Constantinople 177

Tarragona 167
Tatian 53, 117
Telesphorus of Rome 123, 139
Tertullian 101, 128, 351 n. 2: his writings 341 n. 3, 390, 399: in Latin 217, and Greek 152 n. 2: on discipline 355, 358 n., 359, 369, 374–375, 397, 399 and n. 1: on doctrine 51: on the Church 32, 35, 37–38, 55, 221: on the ministry 31, 41, **47–48**, 106 n., **127–129**, 134, **201**, **221–224**, 226, 228, 303 and n. 4, 304, 396, **397 n. 1**: on baptism 343, 345, 346 n. 1, 352, **390–392**: on confirmation 393 n. 5: on marriage 404 and n. 2: on non-catholic baptism 151–152, 255, 256: his rigorism 39, 322: his Montanism 20 n. 2, **26–28**, 35, 55, 222, 223, 237, 374–375, 397 n. 1, 404 n. 2: on unchristian professions **323–328**: on Valentinus 291: on the history and conditions of the African church 218–220: Cyprian on 224
Theodore of Oxyrhynchus 174 n. 1
Theodoret of Cyrrhus 85
Theodosius, emperor, 182
Theodotus, Monarchianist 361
Theodotus, Monophysite 213 n. 3
Theophilus of Alexandria 171 n. 2, 172 and n., 208
Therapius, African bishop 240
Thomas Aquinas 145
Timothy 28, 31, 44, 85, 266, 267, 307 n. 1
Timothy Aelurus 214
Titus 85
Trajan, emperor, 99, 207
Tralles, church of 114
Trofimus, Italian bishop 162 n.
Tyconius, Donatist 183

Ulpian 341 n. 4

Valentinus, gnostic 10, 17 n. 2, 98, 117, 291, 300, 373 n. 7
Vandals 178
Vettius Epagathus, martyr 290 n. 2
Victor of Rome 52, 140 n. 2, 361
Vincent of Lerins 153 n. 4

Wiclif 10

Xystus of Rome 123, 140

Zacchaeus 298 n. 1

IV

INDEX OF SUBJECT-MATTER

Absolution (*or* Reconciliation) 315, 319, 371–373, 380: refusal of 373–377: absolution *in extremis* 235, 237, 377 n. 1, 398: minister of, the bishop 279–280, 381, 383–385, 397–398, presbyters 384, 386, 387, 398, deacons 398, martyrs 399

Acolytes, minor order, 230 n. 1, 302 and n. 5, 305, 389

Advent, Second, early anticipation of, 108–109

Agape 330, 354: *see* p. 427

Apollinarians 158, 178

Apologists of the second and third centuries 100, 115, 322 n. 1, 338

Apostasy (*and see* Idolatry) 149, 359 and n. 2, 360, 361, 362

'Apostle,' the: *see* apostolus p. 427

Apostles: connotation of the word 65; their authority 41–42, 77, 81, 91, 108: St Peter and the rest 245: apostles and prophets and teachers in N.T. 64, 65, 67–70, 76, and in the *Didache* 65–66, 68, 77: apostles and the local ministry 81–83, 110: apostles and the local churches 105, 109: conception of their position in Clement of Rome 110–113, in Ignatius 114, in Hegesippus 118–119, in Irenaeus 45–46, 122–125, 133, in Tertullian 47, 106 n., 128, in Hippolytus 129, in Origen 50, in Cyprian 130–131, in Firmilian 130–131, in Eusebius 135, 137–138

Apostolate and episcopate 85–86, 140–142, 279, 381 and n. 1, n. 2

Apostolic churches 46–48, 105–106, 109, 123, 128, 130–131, 135

Apostolic Church Order 270, 301, 302, 385 n. 5, n. 8, 386, 388 n. 9

Apostolic Constitutions and *Canons* 155 n., 159 and n. 1, 161 and n., 162 n., 270, 278–281, 308 n., 311, 312, 331 n. 2, 370

Apostolic Creed 101–102: *and see* Creed

Apostolic Scriptures 103–104, 338: *and see* Scriptures

Apostolic Succession: original meaning 46–48, 95–96, 104–108, 109–132, 134–138, 143, 147, 192–193, 196: change of meaning in 96, 129, 132, 146, 194, 196. Claim of the Gnostics to 98, 105, 116 and n., 200

Apostolic Tradition 45, 49–50, 128, 269, 273 and n. 4, 307, 309, 320, 337

Arianism, Arians 97, 182: Arian baptism 145 n., 167 and n. 1, 212–213: Arian ordinations 170–174, 178 and notes, 185 and note 1, 213 and n. 1

Army: *see* Military service

Baptism: the meaning of baptism 22, 150–151, 196, 316: relation of baptism to the Church 144, 182, 189, 258–261. The person to be baptized, infants 352–353, ineligible occupations 321–330. The preparation for baptism, *see* Catechumenate: the fast before baptism 341 and n. 3: the rite of baptism 342–345, 347–349: the formula of baptism 160 and n., 345–346 and 346 n. 6: the time of baptism 255, 340, 353. Baptism and confir-

mation 165–168, 179, 189–190, 349–351, 377 n. 2, 378 and n. 1, 393 n. 5. The minister of baptism: bishop 223, 255, 342, 381 and n. 2, 383–384, 390 391, presbyters and deacons 223, 344, 386–387, 391–392, laymen 222 and notes, 223, 255, 392, 397 n. 1. Doubtful baptisms: clinical baptism 348 and n. 4, 378 n. 1; baptism by women 224, 346 n. 6, 392–393; by schismatics 36, 150–151, 153 n. 1, 157 and n. 1; by heretics 35, 148, 151–152, 157–159, 188–190; by pagans 191–192 and n. 1, 195 n. 2. Baptism of blood 331 and n. 1, 378; of desire 378 n. 2

Bishops (*see also* Episcopate): the name 83, 84 (*and see* episcopus p. 427): alternative titles indicative of presidency 394 n. 3, or of priesthood 129 and n. 2, n. 3, 223, 226, 279–280, 381 and n. 1, n. 2. The qualifications, moral 230–231, 282, official 306: unworthy bishops 125, 162 n., 185–187, 232, 308, 398. The election and confirmation 107, 230–231, 274, 299, 384, 400, 406: vocation 299, 307 and notes: consecration 274–276, 278–282, 303, 308, 381–382, 400. The office (of grace and authority, not force, 406 and n. 2): oversight and government 84, 229 (including funds 87); guardianship of the tradition of doctrine 46–47, 105–107, 129 n. 2, 307; celebration of the Eucharist 87, 228, 282, 394 and n. 1, 406 (liturgical freedom 294, 351 n. 6); authority over sacraments generally 196, 381 and n. 2, 383–385, 389, as normal minister of all (baptism 223, 255, 390, eucharist 394, absolution 397–398), and exclusive minister of some (confirmation 180 and n. 1, 349, 393 and n. 5, 407, ordination 400–402, 407); discipline 41, 363–364, 383–385. Relation of bishops to the apostles 46, 47, 105–106, 108, 123–128, 130, 137–139; to their own local church and people 107–108, 126, 129, 131, 132, 239, 365, 372–373; to the Church at large 107–108, 131; to other bishops 240–244; to visiting bishops 384, 385 n. 1, 394; to presbyters 83–84, 124 and n. 1, 233–236, 275–277, 301, 303, 385–386, 389, 394; to deacons 387 and n. 3, 389. 'One bishop' 170 n., 238, 243 n. 1, 249–250, 402 n. § 5

Blasphemy 359 and n. 2, 360

Bona Dea, worship of 97

Caecilianists 183: *and see* Caecilian p. 430

Canon Law, unwritten 358 and n.: beginnings of written 359, 362

Canons of Hippolytus 270, 276, 277, 281, 283–284, 287–288, 303 and n. 2, 304, 311, 312

Capital punishment, attitude of the Church to 323, 325, 326

Catechesis 331: moral 332–333 and 333 n. 1; doctrinal 333 (and n. 2)–339: *Catecheses* 331 n. 3, 332–333, 333 notes 1 and 2

Catechetical schools 133, 137, 332 and n. 3

Catechists *or* Doctors (*and see* doctor p. 427) 305 n. 1, 320 and n. 2, 330, 331 and n. 2, n. 3, 339–340

Catechumens and catechumenate 320–321, 330–331, 339–342; their Mass 330 n. 4, 331: among the Marcionites 39, 330 n. 4

Catholic Christianity 22 n. 4, 32 and n. 4

Catholic Church: *see under* Church, *and see* catholica p. 427

Catholic and Roman 106, 117, 249 and n. 3, 250, 262

Chalcedonians 183, 211, 213

Charismatic ministry: not to be limited to one sort of ministry 30–33, 60–75, 78–79, 272, 307: *see also* charisma p. 427

Charity, the gift of, according to Irenaeus 127: in Cyprian 53, 184, 241 n., 244, 261, 262: according to Augustine 179–180, 184, 190 and n., 195

Chrism: *for the* word, *see* chrisma p. 427; *for the* thing, *see* Unction
Church, the Christian (*for the* name *see* ecclesia p. 427): divine 4–5, spiritual 15–16, 32–35, and in a sense pre-existent 8, 11–12: One, since there is One Body and One Spirit 26, 69, 127, 242–247, 253, 254, 335; Holy, for the Spirit is Holy 13, 17, 102, 149, 162 n., 186, 195, 280 n. 2, 335, 344 and n. 4, 349, 359; Catholic, because extending to all mankind 23, 24–25, 54, 106, 295 n. 1, 335; Apostolic, because it contains the apostolic tradition and succession 96, 101–106, 108–112, 114, 118–119, 122–124, 128, 129 and n. 2, 130, 137–138: but the one Church admits of local variations 52–53, 241 n. 1, 254, 261, and the holy Church is not free on earth from imperfections 14, 17, 38–39: relation of the visible to the invisible Church 9–19, 21–22. Titles of the Church: Mother and Virgin 13–16, 36–38 and n. 3, 239, 351 n. 2: in contrast with heretical bodies the 'great Church' 23 n. 2, 96, or the 'Catholic Church' 18, 25, 26
Churches, the, in relation to the Church 19–23, 76–77, 91, 106–107, 131–132
Church Orders 268–271: and see *Apostolic Church Order*, *Apostolic Constitutions*, *Canons of Hippolytus*, *Didache*, *Didascalia*, *Hippolytean Church Order*, *Statutes of the Apostles*, *Testament of the Lord*
Circumcellions 183
Clergy (*see* clerus p. 427, ordo no. 2 p. 428: *ordo* is clergy, bishop included, as opposed to laity 221 and n. 4, 380; *clerus*, the sum of the *ecclesiastici ordines* 381 n. 4, excludes minor orders 230 n. 1, 297, 304, 401, and in Cyprian's use excludes bishop 238 n. 3, 372 n. 2, 373 n. 6, thus = 'presbyters and deacons,' but *Auct. de Rebapt.* uses 'minor clerus' for presbyters and deacons 392 n. 2, thus including bishop). The clergy, contrasted with the laity 221 and n. 4, 225, bear 'witness' in the election of a bishop 231 and n. 2; assist the bishop in baptism 391, in the Eucharist 226 n. 2, 386, in discipline 364, and in absolution 372 n. 2, 373 and n. 6, 398; and in case of need baptize and reconcile without him 166 n. 1, 392 n. 2, 237, 398. At the end of the period minor orders begin to be included 304–305, and the conception of grades of the clergy developes 226 n. 5, 306
Collective episcopate: *see* Episcopate *ad fin.*
Common Prayers 330, 351 and n. 2, 367, 368, 378 n. 1, 388
Communion: to be in the full communion (communio) of the Church, 241 n., 261, 356, is to have the right and duty of communion in the Eucharist (ius communicationis 379) 353, 406; for forfeiture of that right, 315, 355, excommunication, 357, 363–364, or deprivation of communion, 366, 380, is the penalty, and absolution is its restoration 373 and n. 6, 384. Sunday communion 353; daily, in the reserved Eucharist, 354 and n. 1, n. 10: of neophytes 351–352, of children 353 n. 7, of the sick 354, of the dying 354 and n. 11. Attendance without communion 368 and n. 4
Concubinage, attitude of the Church to 330
Confession of faith (ὁμολογία) 343 and n. 5
Confession of sins (ἐξομολόγησις, *see* p. 427) 357 and n. 4, 372; allowed once only 373–374, but cf. 361 and 373 n. 7
Confessors 289–292, 309: *and see* Martyrs
Confirmation (*see also* Seal, Sign of the Cross, Unction): the Gift or Seal of the Holy Ghost 22, 165, 318, 350 and notes 1, 2, 3, 383–384, 393 (contrast 180): normally part of baptism 377 n. 2 (and therefore not always separately mentioned 378 n. 1), following it 349, or, exceptionally, preceding it 350–351, 351 n. 1: separated from it only in the absence of the bishop 166 and n. 1, 393. The minister is the apostle 318, prophet 378 n. 1, bishop

381 and n. 2, 383, 384, 393: if later presbyters confirmed in the East, it was with chrism consecrated by the bishop 393 n. 5. The 'matter' is in N.T. the laying on of hands 318, and so in the West 169 n. 1, 349 (the laying on of hands with which converts baptized outside the Church were reconciled being regarded as Confirmation 165–167, 345, 350 n. 1, till Jerome 179, and Augustine 180, 190), but in the East unction (chrism) 169 and n. 1, 178, 350 and n. 3: accompanying rites in the West are Unction or Chrism, Consignation or Sign of the Cross, and Kiss of Peace 349–350: the 'form' is the accompanying prayer for grace 349. Validity of heretical confirmation according to Augustine 190, and Severus 213 and n. 3

Consignation: *see* Sign of the Cross

Councils: *see* Synods

Creed, the: connexion with the Rule of Faith 51, 334, with the catechesis and baptism 334, 343–344, and in Rome with the baptismal formula 345: by way of 'question and answer' 344 and notes 2 and 4 (*ad fin.*), 346 n. 6: in the singular (as conciliar creeds in the plural) 335 n. 2. The Apostles' Creed 101–102, 334: Old Roman Creed of the second century 102, 334, of the third 344 and n. 4, of the fourth 334–335, 335 n. 1: Eastern (Caesarean) Creed of Eusebius 334–335: Egyptian Creed 335: African Creed 36 n. 5, 259 and n. 5, 344 n. 4: Spanish Creed 344 n. 4: among heretics 345

Cross, Sign of the: *see* Sign

Deacons: a permanent element as the third rank in the Christian clergy 91, 222, 223 n. 1; with the general characteristic of subordinate 'ministry' 286 and n. 2, 287, 389; like the Seven of the Acts 81–82, 288, 298. Their appointment: election by the people 82, 286, 287, 299, 401; ordination by laying on of hands by apostles 82, or bishop 286, 383, 401, with appropriate prayer 288, 298. Their ministry to the Church 298, 387 and n. 2; to the bishop 81, 287, 364–365, 387 and n. 3, 401; to presbyters 387, 395, 402 n. § 1. Their liturgical functions: normally dependent 389, whether at baptism 343, 387, 391, or the Eucharist 351, 352, 387–388, 388 n. 1, n. 6, 396, 407, or absolution 398; by exception, independently, baptizing 353, 387, 391–392, 392 n. 2, reconciling 237, 398, 408, but not celebrating 394, 396. Their administrative functions 81–82, 287, 365: out of these develope in the third century the offices of subdeacon 305, 389, and acolyte 389; at Rome 302. Deacons as rectors of parishes 387 n. 1, 396; their growing presumption 286 and n. 3, 396 and n. 5, n. 6. From deacon to priest 288, 306: from deacon to bishop 275, 306

Deaconesses 290, 293–294, 296, 343 n. 4, 393

Deposit, the 44–45, 107

Didache (*Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*) 23, 59–63, 65–66, 67–69, 71–72, 77–78, 80, 87–89, 273, 294, 332–333, 348, 349, 394

Didascalia (*and see* p. 416) 301, 304, 327, 333, 363–365, 369–370, 383, 393, 394, 398

Diphysites (*i.e.* Chalcedonians) 211, 213

Discipline of the Church, the penitential (*see also* Penance, Excommunication, Absolution): from the idea of the Christian society and fellowship 40, 315, 355, it followed that incompatibility with its principles, whether of morals or of faith, 359–363, involved exclusion from fellowship. This discipline was exercised in accordance with the Rule of Faith and Rule of Discipline 358 n., by the community and its officers 40–41, 356, 365; in the preliminary stages by the bishop 356, 357 n. 4, 363, in the judicial

stage by bishop and clergy 364, in the final sentence by the bishop and the whole church 357, 365, as well as in the restoration to fellowship 372–373. In detail the rules were modifiable 39, and were modified in the third century as to perpetual exclusion 149, 156–157, 374–376, in the fourth and fifth centuries as to ordination or restoration to office of penitents 162–164. Discipline among the Marcionites 39–40
Diversity in unity 52–53, 184, 194, 241 n., 254, 261
Docetism, Docetists 97, 102, 126, 337
Doctors: *see* Catechists
Donatism, Donatist controversy (*see also* Donatus, p. 431) 95, 145, 149–150, 151, 159, 163, 170 n., 173 n., 181–184, 185–187, 190, 193 and n.
Doorkeepers, minor order 302 n. 5, 389, 390
Doxology in the *Hippolytean Church Order* 280 and n. 1

East, churches of the, their doctrine and discipline: on lay baptism 255; on female baptism 393; on heretical or schismatical baptism 145, 153, 157–159, 161, 255–257; on confirmation with chrism 169 n. 1, by presbyters 393 n. 5, of those baptized outside 165, 213; on heretical and schismatical orders 146, 168, 175–176, 178, 211, 213; on penitent clerics 162 n.; on minor orders 305, 388 and n. 10: their reckoning of episcopal succession 141: their creeds 335 and n. 2: their discipline 355–356. Their history: features of the Arian struggle in 171–172: prevalence of heresies in 159 n. 1, 255. Unity of East and West 54, 56: temporary breach with Rome 175
Easter: *see* Paschal season, Paschal controversy
Ebionites 126
Egyptian Church Order 320 and n. 1: see *Hippolytean Church Order*
Election of clergy generally 299; of bishops 107, 230–231, 274, 300, 384, 400, 401 n. 4, 406; of presbyters 283 and n., 299 n. 1, 401 n. 4 (contrast 285, 383); of deacons 82, 286 (contrast 287–288), 401
Episcopacy, Episcopate (*see also* Bishops): origin and early history of 85–87, 88; theory of Harnack 60–61, 63–66; witness of Clement of Alexandria 49; assistance of prophecy 28–30; relation to presbyterate 83–84, 394 and n. 1: identification with apostolate 140–142. The collective episcopate 113, 244, 250, 253; cf. 106, 117
Eucharist (*see also* Communion): so called from the Great Thanksgiving, followed by the Great Amen, which is the consecration 351–352, 406–407; other names for 237. The central act of the Church 22, 54, 87, 353–354, 406–407; and of the sacraments, 407. The minister: prophets 66, bishop 87, 279–280, 381, 383, 394–395, 'priests' 227–228, 395–396, presbyters as concelebrants 386, 407, or delegates 237, 238, 387, 395: not deacons 396: the case of necessity 221–222, 237–238, 397 n. 1. The rite 87, 268, 282, 351–352 and notes: freedom of liturgical form for prophets 66, 294, and bishops 294–295, 351 n. 6. Invalid eucharists 35, 36, 162 n., 167–168, 186, 395: contrast 261
Eunomians 158
Evagrians 171 n. 2
Evangelists 65
Excommunication (*see also* Communion) 355–357, 363–366: grounds for 319 n. 5, 359–360, 362–363: instances of, in second and third centuries 361–362
Exorcism of catechumens 341 and n. 2 (cf. n. 4), 342 and n. 2, 343

Exorcists (*see also* Healers), minor order 230 n. 1, 282, 296, 302 n. 5, 305, 389, 390

False-witness 359 and n. 2, 360
First Church Order 270 etc.: see *Hippolytean Church Order*
Fraud 359, 360 and n. 7

Gentile Christians and Churches 7, 9, 83–84, 85–86, 99, 116
Gnosticism, Gnostic controversy (*see also* Valentinians, Marcionites) 45–46, 96–99, 100–105, 115–116, 119, 121–122, 127, 128: their sacraments 148, 151–152, 157 n.: baptismal formula 346 and n. 3
Gospels (*see also* Scriptures) 4, 103–104, 109: Gospel-book 278 and n. 3; reading of the Gospel 389
Grace, Grace-gift (χάρις, χάρισμα) 72–75
Greek language 122, 131, 152 n. 2, 211, 218, 224, 241, 302 n. 2

Healers (*see also* Exorcists) 282, 295–296, 305, 309
Hearers, among catechumens 339; among penitents 368
Hellenizing influences 32 n. 4, 83
Heresy (Heretics) guarded against by instruction 337: by excommunication 45, 359 and n., 2, 361. Heresies specially Eastern 159, 255: heresy at first convertible with Gnosticism 35, 148, 151–152, 337: then distinguished from schism 151 n. 2, 152, 157 and n., 175–176. Heretical baptism and heretical orders 151, 161–162, 213 (*see also* Baptism, Orders): heretical baptism and heretical eucharists 35, 36, 262, 395
Hippolytean (or *First*, or *Egyptian*) *Church Order* 268–269, 273 n. 4, 320 and n. 1, 401: on catechumenate 320–342: on baptism and confirmation 342–349, 378 n. 1, 393: on the eucharistic rite 282, 351–352: on ordinations 269–271; of bishops 274, 279–281, 381, 400; of presbyters 277, 283–285, 386, 400–401; of deacons 286–287, 388, 401; of confessors 289; of minor orders 295–296, 304–305, 389, 401
Holy Spirit: *see* Spirit, the Holy (*and similarly for* Holy Orders, Holy Scriptures, *etc.*)

Iconoclastic controversy 173 n. 1; *cf.* 177
Idolatry, idols 322–323, 359, 360, 362, 363, 374–376
Imposition of Hands: *see* Laying on of Hands
Interpreters, minor order in Egypt 297
Interrogations, Baptismal 344 and n. 2, n. 4, 346 n. 6, 353
'Invalid' and 'irregular' 95, 146, 232–233
Irvingites 108
Isis worship 97, 322
Israel, the New 6, 7, 8, 20, 317

Jerusalem, the New 12 n., 38
Jewish Christianity 116, 118
Jewish influences in Christianity (*see also* Old Testament): Jewish origins 7–9; synagogue organization 82; Levitical ministry 110, 141, 223, 228, 230 and n. 4, 239, 281, 285; elders 285; marriage benediction 405 and n. 3
Judaism and Christianity 7, 83, 99, 100, 115, 116

Kingdom of God 4, 24
Kiss of Peace 283, 349, 378 n. 1
Kneelers: catechumens 339; penitents 368

Latin 122, 131, 217–218
Laying on of hands (with appropriate prayer, 'manus impositio...quid est aliud nisi oratio super hominem?' 190 n.; 'manus imponitur per benedictionem advocans et invitans Spiritum sanctum' 350 n. 1): on catechumens 330, 331, 342: in exorcism 341 and n. 2: in confirmation 22, 31 n. 1, 161 and n., 349, 350 n. 1, n. 3, 351 n. 1, 381 n. 2, 383, 393, 407: in ordination, N.T. 31 n. 1, 75 n., 82, 265–266, of bishops 231, 275, 278, 400, of presbyters 275, 298, 386, of deacons 286, but not for minor orders 295, 297, 401: in reconciliation of penitents 163, 237 and notes, 372 n. 2, 373 and n. 6, 383, 384, 386: reconciliation or confirmation? 163 n., 165, 166 n. 1, 167, 189–190: reconciliation or ordination? 177, 208–210
Lent 340–341
Lessons 283, 331 and n. 3, 342, 389
Liturgy, *see* Eucharist, rite of: Liturgical freedom 66, 294–295, 351 n. 6
Luciferians (*and see* Lucifer p. 432) 159, 163, 174 n. 1

Macedonians 158, 178, 212
Magic 329, 359 and n. 1, 360
Magistracies, attitude of the Church to 323–324
Magna Mater, worship of 97, 322
Manichees 157 n.
Marcionism, Marcionites (*and see* Marcion p. 432) 55, 116, 126, 148: their 'Church' 23 n. 2, 25, 26: their discipline 31, 39–40: their rites 330 n. 4, 346 n. 6, 349 n. 2: their attitude to O.T. 53, 337, 338
Marcosians 126 n., 346 n. 3
Maronite rite 382 n.
Marriage 321, 330, 403–405, 408: re-marriage 222 and n. 2, 392 and n. 4, 396, 397 n. 1
Martyrs (those who had died for the faith) 290 n. 2, 331 and n. 1, 378: (those who had suffered for the faith) 290 n. 2, 304, 398–400
Mass of the Catechumens 330 and n. 4, 331, 342, 367; of the faithful 282, 330 and n. 4, 351; of the penitents 367 and n. 3
Meletian schism in Egypt 174 n. 1, 176, 402 n. § 4
Military service, attitude of the Church to 324–326: military oath 325 and n. 2
Milk and honey, in Baptism 351, 352 and n. 2
Ministry: *see* Charismatic, Prophet, Bishop, Presbyter, Deacon, Clergy, Minor Orders, Women
Minor Orders (*see also* Reader, Subdeacon, Acolyte, Exorcist, Door-keeper, Interpreter) 230 n. 1, 295–296, 299, 304–306, 388–389, 390
Mithras, worship of 97
Monarchianism 149
Monophysites 97, 167, 183, 211, 212
Montanism 33 and n. 2, 149, 151, 272, 293–294: in the East (*and see* Montanus p. 433) 152, 153 n. 1, 157 n., 158 n., 273 and n. 3; in Tertullian 20 n. 2, 26–28, 35, 55, 222, 223, 237, 374–375, 397 n. 1, 404 n. 2; in the West generally 121, 126 n., 262
Moral instruction 331–333, 333 n. 1
Mother, the Church as 13, 16, 36–38 and n. 3, 239, 351 n. 2

Neophytes, communion of 351–352
Nestorians 97, 212, 350: Monophysite name for Catholics 213
Novatianism, Novatianists (*and see* Novatian, p. 433) 53 n. 1, 157, 158 n., 176–177, 208–210, 242–243, 249, 257, 376

Oil (*and see* Chrism *and* Unction) of exorcism 342, 343: of 'thanksgiving' 342 and n. 8, 345: of confirmation 349, 350 n. 3: for the sick 405, 408: consecrated by the bishop 342, 391, 393, 405, 408
Old Testament in the Christian Church 7–9, 53, 98, 281, 285, 307 n. 2, 336, 337, 338–339
Orders, Holy: 'form' and 'matter' 156, 196, 266, 308: Gift of the Holy Spirit 30–33, 168, 196, 272, 275, 279–280, 288, 290, 307–308, 309; Spirit of priesthood 279, 381 (*cf.* 227); of counsel 287, 386: unworthy ministers and the loss of the Gift 149, 162 and n., 163, 182, 185–186, 187, 292, 308. Non-catholic orders: the problem 150, 151, 164, 169–170, 183, 186–187, 194; relation to baptism 145–147, 162, 168, 181; invalid 145, 146, 147, 161, 165, 168–169, 171, 173; valid under conditions, Basil 168, Alexander of Antioch 171 and n. 2, Ambrose 172, Athanasius 173 and n., Nicaea? 177; valid absolutely, Augustine 145, 146, 170, 181, 184, 190–191, 194: Roman attitude to 159 n. 2, 161, 168 and n. 1, 174–175, 178
Ordination 30–31, 107, 265–266, 308–310: re-ordinations 170, 176–179, 213. Ordination and confessors 289–292, 309; and minor orders 401. Ordination by presbyters 401, 402 n.
Outsiders, attitude of the Church to 18, 33–34, 195, 260

Pagan worships 97, 322: pagan festivals 327: pagan demonology 341 n. 2: pagan accompaniments of State service, civil 323–324, or military 325, of school life 327. Baptism by a pagan 191, 192 and n. 1, n. 2
Parishes and parish priests 302–303, 387 and n. 1, 391, 402 n. § 1
Paschal or Easter season, baptisms at 340, 353: Paschal vigil, service of 342 and n. 3: Paschal or Easter controversy 52–53, 121, 254, 342 n. 3, 361
Pastor, Pastorate 42, 65, 70
Pastoral Epistles (1 Tim., Titus, 2 Tim.) 43, 44–45, 81, 84, 103, 227, 265–267, 301, 306
Paulianists (*see also* Paul of Samosata p. 433) 157, 181 n. 2, 212
Penance (not Penances 368): the common system 366, 368–369, 371, 373–374: the local differences (*a*) in the liturgical arrangements 367–368, (*b*) in length of the penance 370: the chronological developments 374–376. Penance a disqualification for the ministry 162 (and n.)–164, 173 and n., 373 n. 6. Death-bed re-admission 237, 371 and n. 1, 377 and n. 1, 387, 398 and n. 4, n. 5, 400. *See also* Discipline, Excommunication, Absolution
Persecutions: from Nero to M. Aurelius 99–100; in 177 A.D. 121; in 180 A.D. 219; of Severus in 202 A.D. 121, 219 n. 2; of Decius 149, 291–292, 361, 370, 376, 377 n. 1, 399; of Diocletian ('Great Persecution') 132, 134, 149, 326, 361, 362, 370, 376 n. 4; of Licinius 362
Photinians 212
Preaching: a function of the bishop 229 n. 4, not necessarily of the presbyter 236
Pre-existent Church 10–12, 13
Presbyters: name and office of Jewish origin 82–83: their appointment 82–83, 283, 285, 298, 299 and n. 1, 383, 400: their functions in the primitive communities, to rule and to teach 14, 61, 83 (*cf.* 236, 302 and n. 2, 386): their relation to the primitive *episcopus* 83–84, 276; their relation to the later bishop still that of a body (and therefore individually inconspicuous 236, 387, 395), as his counsellors 233–236, 285, 302, 385–386, and as his fellow-ministers and priests 386–387, 395, 406, whether in baptism and unction 343–345, 386, 391, in the eucharist 352, 386, 407, in absolution

386, 398, in ordination 274 n. 2, 275, 298, 386, 400, in unction of the sick 405; but not acting without him save by delegation for baptism 391, for the eucharist 237, 395, 407, for absolution 237, 398, 408. This delegation in time becomes permanent 302–303, 387, 391–392, 407, and includes the services of a deacon 387, 395, 402 n. § 1: but this 'evolution of the presbyterate' 236, 285, 303, though tending to equalize him with the bishop 276, never extends to ordination 276, 287, 401, 402 n., and never, save partially in the East 393 n. 5, to confirmation 393. The presbyters at Alexandria 86 n., 402 n. § 3

Priesthood of the whole Church 227, 238, 324 and n. 9: of the ministry 221, 226, 227, 232, 280, 395; *and see* ἀρχιερεύς, ἱερεύς, sacerdos, pp. 427, 428

Prophecy 78: opposed to the Church hierarchy by Montanism 27, 273, 293, in accord with it in the Church 28–30, 265

Prophetesses 272, 293–294; outside the Church 346 n. 6, 361

Prophets (*and see* Prophecy): in the primitive Church next to Apostles 65, 67, 77: Apostles, Prophets and Teachers 61, 63–64, 66–67, 69–70, 72, 76: Prophets and Teachers 66, 67, 77, 90, 273, 292: Prophets and the local church 62, 68, 71, 89: Prophets and the Eucharist 62, 66, 294, 295: in the post-Apostolic Church 69, 272, 293, 294, 296

Puritan movements in the early Church 149, 157, 176

Quintilianists 273 n. 2

Readers, minor order 230 and n. 1, 291, 295–296, 297, 299, 305 and n. 1, 306, 331 and n. 3, 388–389, 390, 394, 401 and n. 3

Reconciliation of penitents: *see* Absolution

Renunciations at Baptism 327 and n. 3, 343 and n. 2

Reservation of the Eucharist 354 and n. 1, n. 10

Rigorism 39, 149, 155 n., 156–157, 163, 322, 374–376: in Spain 370, 376, 392

Rule of Faith (*or* of Truth) 51–52, 101–102, 334, 336, 358 n.: *and see* canon, p. 427

Sabellians 158

Sacraments 33 (Baptism 342–349, 391–393, Confirmation 349–351, 393, the Eucharist 282, 351–352, 394–397, Absolution 372–373, 397–400, Ordination 400–402, Marriage 403–405, Unction of the Sick 405, *and see under the separate headings*: but of these Marriage and Unction are not in early times treated as sacraments of the Church 408, while of the rest the Eucharist is central 406, and the others are avenues to it 407, Baptism and Confirmation being strictly two parts of one sacrament 377 n. 2). Relation of the Sacraments to the Church 143–145, 147–148, 161, 180, 182, 187–192, 195–196, 258: to unworthy ministers 125, 149, 162–164, 185–187, 232, 261, 292, 308 and n., 398. The minister of all sacraments normally the bishop 381–385, with presbyters as his assistants in the priestly parts, and deacons in the subordinate parts, of the action 385–387, 389: all other ordinary ministration of the sacraments is by delegation from him 196, 236–238, 255, 391, 395, but this delegation becomes more frequent and regular 302, 387 and n. 1, 391. Exceptional cases of necessity, recognized 392, 398 and n. 4, doubtful 221–222, 397 n. 1

Schism (schisms of Hippolytus at Rome 149; of Meletius in Egypt 174 n. 1, 176, 402 n. § 4; at Antioch 170–171; *and see* Montanism, Novatianism, Donatism) condemned from the beginning 20 n. 2, 22: a violation of

charity and the Spirit of charity 34, 127–128. Schismatics, like heretics, excluded from communion 359, 361, indeed they had excommunicated the Church 363: like heretics, devoid of the succession 108, 125, and of the sacraments 35–36, 147: so Irenaeus 126–127, and Cyprian 36, 243. Distinction between schism and heresy mooted in the East early in the third century 150–152, 153 n. 1, and acted on in the fourth 151 and n. 2, both as to the recognition of their baptism 157, 158 n., and as to the status of their clergy 176–177, at least apart from the leaders 176, 185 n. 1

Schoolmasters, attitude of the Church to 327

Scriptures, the Holy (*and see* Old Testament, Apostolic Scriptures, Gospels, Pastoral Epistles): the property of the Church 126, 221, and the model of its system of admission and discipline 316–319, 358 n. *ad fin.*: their authority 50, 118: their influence on liturgical language 281, 285. The Scriptures and the faith 51–52, 333. Collections of texts 225, 339

Scrutiny before Baptism 320–321, 340, 341

Seal (*σφραγίς*, p. 428: the 'Seal' is the signaculum, or Sign of the Cross, *which see*) 54, 178, 350 and n. 2, 384, 393

Sign of the Cross (*or* Consignation) 325, 342 and n. 2, 349, 350 and n. 1, n. 2, 393 n. 4

Spectacles, public 327–328, 328 n. 2, n. 3

Spirit, the Holy: as one Person of the Holy Trinity 16, 27, 102, 126, 259, 280, 332, 333, 335, 336, 344, 345, 346, 349, 352, 378 (with mention of the one or holy Church added 16, 27, 35, 126, 259, 335, 344, 352): as the Spirit of Christ 5. The Holy Spirit in the Church (as the One Spirit in the One Body 96, 127, 243, 246) 33–35, 38, 55, 161, 212, and not promised outside the Church 37, 165, 166, 189, 195, 259; yet not in every sense limited to the Church 33–34. The Holy Spirit in the members of the Church 10, 20, 55, 104, 126, 318, the Spirit-bearing Body 148, 299. The diverse manifestations of the Spirit in the Church 69, 74: in prophecy 28–30, 80 n. 2; in direct vocation to exceptional, 30, 64, 307 n. 1, 309, or to ordinary ministries 29, 112, 299; ordinations to the ministry 32, 42. The Holy Spirit as guide in doctrine 43, 47, 48 and n. 2: as a permanent gift to the Church in the Ministry 45, 48, 91, 129 and n. 3, 273 n. 5, 274, the same to bishops as to apostles 129 n. 3, 281, 292, 381; but withdrawn from unworthy ministers 162 n., 185, 186, 232. The Holy Spirit in the sacraments 144, 196: in Baptism 180, 349, but not in heretical baptism 189–190: in Confirmation 22, 161, 165–167, 168, 178, 179, 318, 350 and n. 1, n. 3, 378, 383, 393; in the Eucharist 162 n.; in Ordination 161, 168, 196, 308, of bishops 275, 279–281, 298, of presbyters 284 n. 2, 298, 386 (contrasted with deacons 287, 401, and with confessors 290, 292, 309), of deacons 288. The Holy Spirit in the Scriptures 50, 245, 336. Montanist view of the Spirit and the Church 27, 28

Sponsors 320, 340, 353

Statutes of the Apostles 270, 271, 289 n., 312

Subdeacons, minor order 230 n. 1, 295–296, 297, 299, 302 and n. 5, 305, 306, 383, 388 and n. 10, 389, 401

Subordinationism 149

Succession (*see also* Apostolic Succession): different forms of succession 133–134, 137: episcopal successions in the greater churches 135–136, 138–140

Synods 54, 241–242, 254, 358–359, 362

Teachers (*and see* doctor p. 427): in the primitive Church grouped with Apostles and Prophets 61, 63–64, 66–69, 72: with Prophets 62, 63, 66, 67, 77: with Pastors 65, 67, 70, 78, 79: not a separate office 78. In the later Church 'teachers' were sometimes presbyters 236, 302 and n. 2, but not necessarily 320, 331 and n. 2. The bishop as 'teacher' 229, 295 n. 1, 304 n. 2
Teaching of the Twelve Apostles: see *Didache*
Testament of the Lord 271, 278, 281, 288, 289 n., 297, 302, 311, 312
Theatre, attitude of the Church to 327–329
Throne, Enthronement, of bishops (*see also θρόνος* p. 428): 136 and n. 1, 276, 283, 303–304, 385 and notes
Two Ways, The 71, 332–333, 360

Unction in Confirmation 349–350 and notes, 393 n. 5: Unction of the Sick 405 and n. 5, 408: for other Unctions *see under* Oil
Unity in diversity 52–55, 91–92, 244, 254, 258
Unworthy ministers 38, 125, 149, 185–187, 193, 232, 261, 308 and n., 398

Valentinianism, Valentinians (*and see* Valentinus p. 435) 11–12, 36, 116, 122, 148
Virgin and Mother, the Church as 13–16, 36–38, 38 n. 3
Virgins, order of 293, 295–296, 304, 309, 310
Visible and invisible Church 9–19, 21–22

Widows, order of 267, 293, 295, 296, 304, 305, 340
Women, ministry of, in the Church 272, 293–294, 392, 393, *and see* Deaconesses, Prophetesses, Virgins, Widows: outside the Church, in baptism and perhaps in the Eucharist, 273 and n. 2, 346 n. 6, 392 and n. 5

CAMBRIDGE: PRINTED BY J. B. PEACE, M.A., AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.

WORKS BY H. B. SWETE, D.D.

THE APPEARANCES OF OUR LORD AFTER THE PASSION. A Study in the Earliest Christian Tradition. Crown 8vo. 3*s.* net.

Guardian.—"We rejoice that a book of such importance as this, upon a subject of the deepest interest to every Christian, should have come at the present moment from such competent hands."

THE ASCENDED CHRIST. A Study in the Earliest Christian Teaching. Crown 8vo. 3*s.* net.

Guardian.—"This volume is a sequel and companion to *The Appearances of our Lord after the Passion.* It exhibits the same thoroughness in criticism and the same sobriety of judgment."

THE LAST DISCOURSE AND PRAYER OF OUR LORD. A Study of St John xiv.–xvii. Crown 8vo. 3*s.* net.

Guardian.—"It would be difficult to speak too highly of the deep reverence, the true scholarship, the earnest charity of this book."

THE HOLY CATHOLIC CHURCH: THE COMMUNION OF SAINTS. A Study in the Apostles' Creed. Crown 8vo. 4*s.* 6*d.* net.

THE FORGIVENESS OF SINS: A STUDY IN THE APOSTLES' CREED. Second Impression. Crown 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE NEW TESTAMENT. A Study of Primitive Christian Teaching. 8vo. 8*s.* 6*d.* net.

Guardian.—"All English students of the New Testament have reason to be deeply grateful to Dr Swete for this masterly and, we might almost venture to say, exhaustive book on a profoundly important subject."

THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE ANCIENT CHURCH. A Study of Christian Teaching in the Age of the Fathers. 8vo. 8*s.* 6*d.* net.

Expository Times.—"It is needless to praise the book. In all his tasks, whatever he undertakes to do, Professor Swete does better than anyone has done before him."

LONDON: MACMILLAN AND CO., LTD.

WORKS BY H. B. SWETE, D.D.

THE APOCALYPSE OF ST JOHN. The Greek Text, with Introduction, Notes and Indices. Third edition. 8vo. 15*s.*

Guardian.—"A commentary on the Book of Revelation which is at once of the first rank and yet not over the head of any one who is fairly acquainted with the Greek of the New Testament."

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST MARK. The Greek Text, with Introduction and Notes. Third edition. 8vo. 15*s.*

Critical Review.—"Undoubtedly the best English commentary we possess on Mark."

THE AKHMÎM FRAGMENT OF THE APOCRYPHAL GOSPEL OF ST PETER. 8vo. 5*s.* net.

Critical Review.—"The text of the Petrine fragment is accompanied by admirable notes which give light on many passages. A Translation is also furnished, and an Introduction of forty-seven pages deals in an interesting and instructive way with a variety of matters connected with the find."

Edited by H. B. SWETE, D.D.

ESSAYS ON SOME THEOLOGICAL QUESTIONS OF THE DAY. By Members of the University of Cambridge. 8vo. 12*s.* net.

Guardian.—"The volume is one which must engage the attention of all who are interested in theological speculation in English-speaking countries."

ESSAYS ON SOME BIBLICAL QUESTIONS OF THE DAY. By Members of the University of Cambridge. 8vo. 12*s.* net.

Athenæum.—"This is a remarkable book, and ought to attract the attention of all who are interested in the Bible."

ESSAYS ON THE EARLY HISTORY OF THE CHURCH AND THE MINISTRY. By various writers. 8vo. 12*s.* net.

LONDON: MACMILLAN AND CO., LTD.